



Agenda

California Commission on Teacher Credentialing

July 7-8, 1999 • Commission Offices • 1900 Capitol Avenue • Sacramento, CA 95814

Some of the agenda items are available for viewing on the web.

Click on the  to view the items that are available.

WEDNESDAY, July 7, 1999

Commission Office

1. Closed Session (Chair Norton) 1:00 p.m.

(The Commission will meet in Closed Session pursuant to California Government Code Section 11126 as well as California Education Code Sections 44245 and 44248)

2. Appeals and Waivers Committee (Committee Chair Harvey)

- | | |
|-------|-----------------------------------|
| A&W-1 | Approval of the Minutes |
| A&W-2 | Commission Appeal |
| A&W-3 | Reconsideration of Waiver Denials |
| A&W-4 | Waivers: Consent Calendar |
| A&W-5 | Waivers: Conditions Calendar |
| A&W-6 | Waivers: Denials Calendar |
| A&W-7 | Report on Waiver Process |

THURSDAY, July 8, 1999

Commission Office

1.. General Session (Chair Norton) 8:00 a.m.

- | | |
|------|---------------------------------------|
| GS-1 | Roll Call |
| GS-2 | Pledge of Allegiance |
| GS-3 | Approval of the June 1999 Minutes |
| GS-4 | Approval of the July Agenda |
| GS-5 | Approval of the July Consent Calendar |
| GS-6 | Annual Calendar of Events |
| GS-7 | Chair's Report |
| GS-8 | Executive Director's Report |
| GS-9 | Report on Monthly State Board Meeting |

2. Legislative Committee of the Whole (Committee Chair Gary Reed)



LEG-1 Status of Bills of Interest to the Commission



LEG-2 Analyses of Bills of Interest to the Commission

3. Fiscal Planning and Policy Committee of the Whole (Committee Chair

Veneman)

FPPC-1 Update on the 1999-2000 Governor's Budget

FPPC-2 Proposed 2000-2001 Budget Change Proposal Concepts

4. Preparation Standards Committee of the Whole (Committee Chair Sutro)

PREP-1 Approval of Subject Matter Programs

PREP-2 Recommended Awards of Alternative Certification Support Funds

PREP-3 Consideration of Extension of a Waiver of Regional Accreditation for National Hispanic University

PREP-4 Fourth Report and Additional Recommendations Regarding Implementation of AB 1620 (Scott)

PREP-5 Governor's Proposed Budget for BTSA Programs 1999-2000: Plan for Statewide Expansion

PREP-6 Update on the California Paraprofessional Teacher Training Program

5. Credentials and Certificated Assignments Committee of the Whole (Committee Chair Dauterive)

C&CA-1 Proposed Regulations Related to Reading Instruction Competence Assessment

C&CA-2 Revision of Renewal Process for Professional Clear Credentials

C&CA-3 Proposed Amendments to Title 5 Section 80001 Related to Definitions of Critical Terms

6. Performance Standards Committee of the Whole (Committee Chair Katzman)

PERF-1 Proposed Schedule for Examination Validity Studies

PERF-2 Draft Annual Report on the Praxis and SSAT Examinations in Art, Music, and Physical Education: December 1995 - June 1998
(NOTE: Large file...Please allow sufficient time for downloading).

7. Reconvene General Session (Chair Norton)

GS-10 Report of the Appeals and Waivers Committee

GS-11 Report of Closed Session

GS-12 Commissioners Reports

GS-13 Audience Presentations

GS-14 Old Business

•Quarterly Agenda for July, September & October 1999

GS-15 New Business

GS-16 Adjournment

All Times Are Approximate and Are Provided for Convenience Only

Except Time Specific Items Identified Herein (i.e. Public Hearing)

The Order of Business May be Changed Without Notice

Persons wishing to address the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing on a subject to be considered at this meeting are asked to complete a Request Card and give it to the Recording Secretary prior to the discussion of the item.

Reasonable Accommodation for Any Individual with a Disability

Any individual with a disability who requires reasonable accommodation to attend or participate in a meeting or function of the California Commission on Teacher

Credentialing may request assistance by contacting the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing at 1900 Capitol Avenue, Sacramento, CA 95814; telephone, (916) 445-0184.

NEXT MEETING

September 1-2, 1999

California Commission on Teacher Credentialing



[Top](#) | [CA Home Page](#) | [Governor's Home Page](#) | [About the Commission](#) | [Credential Information](#) | [Examination Information](#)
[Coded Correspondence](#) | [Credential Alerts](#) | [Educational Standards](#) | [Reports-on-Line](#) | [Committee on Accreditation](#)
[Troops to Teachers](#) | [Other Sites of Interest](#) | [Home](#)



California Commission on Teacher Credentialing

Meeting of: July 7-8, 1999

Agenda Item Number: LEG-1

Committee: Legislative

Title: Status of Bills of Interest to the Commission

- ✓ Action
- ✓ Information

Prepared by: Rod Santiago
Office of Governmental Relations

BILLS FOLLOWED BY THE CALIFORNIA COMMISSION ON TEACHER CREDENTIALING

June 23, 1999

CCTC-Sponsored Bills

Bill Number - Author Subject	Previous and Current CCTC Position (date adopted)	Status
AB 309 - Mazzoni Would increase the cap on per intern expenditures in the alternative certification program	Sponsor (3/99)	Senate Appropriations Committee
AB 457 - Scott Would add internet-based sex offenses to the list of specified mandatory revocation offenses	Sponsor (3/99)	Senate Appropriations Committee
AB 466 - Mazzoni Omnibus clean-up bill	Sponsor (3/99)	Senate Education Committee
AB 471 - Scott Would require CCTC to report to the Legislature and the Governor on numbers of teachers who received credentials, internships and emergency permits	Sponsor (3/99)	Senate Education Committee
AB 1067 - Margett Would bring Education Code provisions related to lewd and lascivious Penal Code violations into conformity	Sponsor (4/99)	Senate Appropriations Committee
AB 1282 - Jackson Would require CCTC to make improvements needed to enhance CBEST	Sponsor (4/99)	Senate Education Committee

SENATE BILLS OF INTEREST TO CCTC

Bill Number - Author Subject	Previous and Current CCTC Position (date adopted)	Status
SB 151 - Haynes	Seek Amendments	Assembly

Would allow a person who meets prescribed requirements to qualify for a Professional Clear teaching credential	(2/99) Oppose Unless Amended (4/99)	Education Committee
SB 179 - Alpert Would establish model alternative teacher preparation programs	Support if Amended (2/99)	Held in Senate Appropriations Committee
SB 237 - Karnette Would require that a person may not qualify for an Administrative Services Credential unless he or she has ten years of teaching experience	Oppose (3/99)	Senate Education Committee
SB 395 - Hughes Would remove the sunset date on SDAIE staff development training	Seek Amendments (4/99)	Assembly Education Committee
SB 472 - Poochigian Would establish a three year pilot program to provide grants to school districts using a mathematics specialist to teach mathematics aligned to the statewide content standards in grades 4, 5, and 6	Support (4/99)	Held in Senate Appropriations Committee
SB 489 - Solis Would make findings and declarations related to educational paraprofessionals	Watch (4/99)	Senate Rules Committee
SB 573 - Alarcon Would create a telecommunications-based pilot project in LA county for the purpose of providing support for BTSA or pre-intern teachers in hard to staff schools	Watch (4/99) Support if Amended (5/99)	Held in Senate Appropriations Committee
SB 624 - Schiff Would require SDE to include funding for updating prekindergarten learning development guidelines in future expenditure plans	Watch (4/99)	Assembly Human Services Committee
SB 883 - Haynes Would require CCTC to monitor the performance of graduates of various IHEs that provide educator preparation and would authorize CCTC to take administrative action against specified IHEs	Oppose (4/99)	Senate Education Committee
SB 1061 - Schiff Would waive the credential application fee for first-time specified credential applicants	Support (4/99)	Held in Senate Appropriations Committee
SB 1076 - Vasconcellos Makes findings and declarations related to teacher preparation and credentialing and expresses legislative intent to enact legislation to redesign teacher preparation and credentialing to teach teachers both the process of teaching and the information the teacher is responsible for their pupils learning	Watch (4/99)	Senate Education Committee
SB 1262 - O'Connell/Karnette Would authorize governing school boards or county superintendents to increase the lowest salary on the salary schedule for a certificated employee meeting certain criteria	Support (4/99)	Assembly Education Committee NOTE: Bill language was incorporated into AB 1117 which has been enrolled
SB 1309 - Baca Would require CCTC to regularly notify school districts about laws governing assignment of	Oppose (4/99)	Assembly Education Committee

individuals when certificated teachers are not available

ASSEMBLY BILLS OF INTEREST TO CCTC

Bill Number - Author Subject	Previous and Current CCTC Position (date adopted)	Status
AB 1X - Villaraigosa and Strom-Martin Would establish the Peer Assistance and Review Program for Teachers	Seek Amendments (2/99) CTC amendments adopted	Signed by the Governor
AB 2X - Mazzoni and Cunneen Would establish various programs related to reading and teacher recruitment	Support (2/99) Seek Amendments (3/99) CTC amendments adopted	Signed by the Governor
AB 6 - Calderon Establishes the California Teacher Academy Program	Seek Amendments (2/99) CTC amendments adopted	Held in Assembly Appropriations Committee
AB 17X - Bates Would delete option for local development by IHEs of a teaching performance assessment and require CCTC to administer the assessment	Oppose (2/99)	Dropped by the author
AB 18X - Zettel and Bates Would require all teaching credential holders to pass a subject matter exam to renew the credential. Would require CCTC to establish a Peer Review Task Force	Oppose Unless Amended (2/99)	Dropped by the authors
AB 25X - Baldwin Would make changes to statutes governing the demonstration of subject matter competence	Oppose (2/99)	Dropped by the author
AB 27X - Leach Would require CCTC to conduct a validity study of the CBEST	Oppose Unless Amended (2/99) CTC amendments adopted Watch (3/99)	Signed by the Governor
AB 28X - Leach Would make changes to statutes governing the accreditation framework	Oppose (2/99)	Held in Assembly Education Committee
AB 31 - Reyes Extends APLE Program to applicants who agree to provide classroom instruction in school districts serving rural areas	Support (2/99)	Senate Education Committee
AB 108 - Mazzoni Subject Matter Projects	Support (2/99)	Senate Appropriations Committee
AB 192 - Scott Would create the California Teacher Cadet Program	Support (3/99)	Senate Education Committee
AB 578 - Honda Would require SPI, in consultation with CCTC and IHEs, to develop training requirements for teachers to ensure sufficient training on domestic violence recognition	Watch (4/99)	Senate Education Committee
AB 615 - Runner Would place specified categorical funding programs into block grant programs	Oppose Unless Amended (6/99)	Senate Education Committee

AB 707 - House Would set forth requirements for a services credential with a specialization in school psychology	Seek Amendments (4/99)	Senate Education Committee
AB 752 - Davis Would create two new single subject teaching credentials in dance and in theatre	Watch (4/99)	Held in Assembly Appropriations Committee
AB 770 - Honda Would create a Middle Grades Certificate Program	Seek Amendments (4/99)	Held in Assembly Appropriations Committee
AB 899 - Alquist Would provide that on and after July 1, 2003 a teacher may not be initially assigned to teach math or science at the middle school level unless she or he holds a credential or supplementary authorization in the subject to be taught	Support (5/99)	Held in Assembly Appropriations Committee
AB 908 - Alquist Would require CCTC to adopt or revise standards to address gender equity	Seek Amendments (4/99)	Senate Education Committee
AB 949 - Wiggins Would include holders of services credentials in the definition of teacher for the purposes of participating in the APLE program, the California Mentor Teacher Program, and the BCLAD Certificate	Oppose Unless Amended (4/99)	Assembly Education Committee
AB 961 - Steinberg Would create the Challenged School Teacher Attraction and Retention Act of 1999	Support (4/99)	Senate Education Committee
AB 1006 - Ducheny Would establish a two-year pilot project to provide peer support and mentoring for school counselors	Support (4/99)	Senate Education Committee
AB 1059 - Ducheny Would make various provisions in law related to CLAD training	Seek Amendments (4/99)	Senate Education Committee
AB 1242 - Lempert Would require CCTC to issue a California Professional Credential to persons meeting certain requirements	Seek Amendments (4/99) Oppose (6/99)	Senate Education Committee
AB 1294 - Firebaugh Would require CCTC, SPI, and directors of teacher education at IHEs to produce an annual report related to teacher recruitment, education, and retention programs	Watch (4/99) Oppose (5/99)	Assembly Education Committee
AB 1296 - Firebaugh Would authorize holders of emergency permits and Pre-Intern program participants to participate in BTSA. Would also establish a hard-to-staff school program	Watch (4/99) Seek Amendments (5/99)	Assembly Education Committee



[| Back to the Top |](#)
[| Back to July 1999 Agenda](#)
[| Return to "Agenda Archives" |](#)
[| Return to "About CTC" |](#)





California Commission on Teacher Credentialing

Meeting of: July 7-8, 1999

Agenda Item Number: LEG-2

Committee: Legislative

Title: Analysis of Bills of Interest to the Commission

✓ Action

Prepared by: Rod Santiago

Office of Governmental Relations

LEGISLATIVE GUIDELINES OF THE CALIFORNIA COMMISSION ON TEACHER CREDENTIALING Adopted February 3, 1995

1. The Commission supports legislation which proposes to maintain or establish high standards for the preparation of public school teachers and other educators in California, and opposes legislation that would lower standards for teachers and other educators.
2. The Commission supports legislation which proposes to maintain or establish high standards of fitness and conduct for public school educators in California, and opposes legislation which would lower standards of fitness or conduct for public school educators.
3. The Commission supports legislation which reaffirms that teachers and other educators have appropriate qualifications and experience for their positions, as evidenced by holding appropriate credentials, and opposes legislation which would allow unprepared persons to serve in the public schools.
4. The Commission supports the maintenance of a thoughtful, cohesive approach to the preparation of credential candidates, and opposes legislation which would tend to fragment or undermine the cohesiveness of the preparation of credential candidates.
5. The Commission supports legislation which strengthens or reaffirms initiatives and reforms which it previously has adopted, and opposes legislation which would undermine initiatives or reforms which it previously has adopted.
6. The Commission supports alternatives to existing credential requirements that maintain high standards for the preparation of educators, and opposes alternatives that do not provide sufficient assurances of quality.
7. The Commission opposes legislation that would give it significant additional duties and responsibilities if the legislation does not include an appropriate source of funding to support those additional duties and responsibilities.
8. The Commission supports legislation that affirms its role as an autonomous teacher standards board, and opposes legislation that would erode the independence or authority of the Commission.

Bill Analysis California Commission on Teacher Credentialing

Bill Number:

Assembly Bill 707

Author(s):	Assemblymember George House
Sponsor(s):	California Association of School Psychologists
Subject of Bill:	School Psychologist Credential Qualifications
Date Introduced:	February 24, 1999
Status in Leg. Process:	Senate Education Committee
Current CCTC Position:	Seek Amendments
Recommended Position:	Oppose Unless Amended
Date of Analysis:	June 11, 1999
Analyst(s):	Marilyn Errett and Rod Santiago

Summary of Current Law:

Current law sets the minimum qualifications for a services credential with a specialization in health and for a services credential with a specialization in pupil personnel services, including a Pupil Personnel Services Credential with a Specialization in School Psychology. Current law authorizes the Commission to establish professional standards in the education profession and to approve preparation programs.

Summary of Current Activity by the Commission

The Commission currently issues pupil personnel services credentials in specified areas including school psychology. Programs for these credentials are based upon standards of program quality and effectiveness that outline program content including fieldwork and the competence expectations for candidates.

The Commission has appointed a 25-member panel of Pupil Personnel Services practitioners and trainers, teachers, administrators, parents, and students. The panel includes school psychologists. The panel is reviewing existing standards and competencies and will bring recommendations for revised and up-dated standards to the Commission in December 1999. The decisions of the panel will be based upon research in the field of pupil personnel services including school psychology, national standards, and the expertise of the panel members. As is the Commission's practice, standards are up-dated on a cyclical schedule to insure that preparation programs are cohesively designed and conducted with a rigor that matriculates professionals who provide effective and efficient services to California's students.

Analysis of Bill Provisions

This bill would set forth requirements for a services credential with a specialization in school psychology which would include:

- 1) A postbaccalaureate or graduate degree from a regionally accredited institution of higher education. For applicants who complete a professional preparation program in a state other than California, the degree shall be approved by the appropriate state agency where it was completed.
- 2) Successful completion of 450 hours of approved practicum study.
- 3) Successful completion of a supervised field practice internship of at least 1,200 hours.

The bill would also list the various services that a holder of a school psychology credential could provide, including, but not limited to, services that enhance the academic performance of a pupil, designing of strategies and programs to address problems of pupil adjustment, and consulting with other educators and parents on issues of pupil social development, pupil behavior, and academic difficulties.

Analysis of Fiscal Impact of Bill

This bill would require the Commission to establish a panel to develop standards for a services credential with a specialization in school psychology. Staff estimates that the cost of this would be \$90,000, including staff time.

Analysis of Relevant Legislative Policies by the Commission

The following Legislative policy applies to this measure:

5. **The Commission supports legislation which strengthens or reaffirms initiatives and reforms which it previously has adopted, and opposes legislation which would undermine initiatives or reforms which it previously has adopted.**

Suggested Amendments

Staff suggests the following amendments:

- 1) Remove the requirement for a postbaccalaureate or graduate degree from a regionally accredited institution of higher education.
- 2) Clarify the language pertaining to grandparenting to assure that individuals employed in a school district will retain employment eligibility if they move to another school district. Also clarify that individuals enrolled in programs prior to the implementation date of the bill will not be penalized for completion of the program in which they are enrolled.

Reason for Suggested Position

Proposed Amendment #1

In a time of teacher and school personnel shortages, requiring a masters degree in addition to credential program requirements, comprised of a minimum of 60 semester units, seems imprudent. (In 1997/98, the Commission issued 339 credentials for school psychologists and approved 86 waivers for such credentials.) The credential program standards are designed to prepare individuals to perform all duties and expectations of employment. One of the Commission's goals - one supported through numerous pieces of enacted legislation - is to remove barriers to credentials.

Historically, the Commission has not required a graduate degree as a condition for a credential nor does the Commission approve degree programs. (Federal law mandates completion of a masters degree for holders of the Clinical Rehabilitation Credential. Failure to comply would have resulted in the withholding of federal funds for special education in California.) The powers and duties of the Commission as outlined in Education Code §44225 refer specifically to standards setting. The Commission's responsibility is to set standards, conduct reviews, and accredit standards-based programs that ensure highly skilled and competent school personnel.

Any preparation program may, by institutional choice, require the completion of an advanced degree prior to recommending candidates to the Commission for a credential. Institutions offering credential preparation programs may also choose to follow the accreditation standards of other professional bodies when equivalency to Commission standards can be shown. Such standards may include the requirement of an advanced degree. Current data shows that two-thirds of the individuals earning a pupil personnel services credential with a specialization in school psychology also earned a masters or higher degree.

Proposed Amendment #2

This amendment suggestion aims to clean up current bill language to assure equity in employment issues.



| [Back to the Top](#) |
| [Back to July 1999 Agenda](#)
| [Return to "Agenda Archives"](#) |
| [Return to "About CTC"](#) |





California Commission on Teacher Credentialing

Meeting of: July 7-8, 1999

Agenda Item Number: FPPC-1

Committee: Fiscal Planning and Policy

Title: Update on the Governor's Budget for 1999-2000

✓ Information

Prepared by: John Walstrom, Analyst
Fiscal and Business Services

BACKGROUND

At the June 1999 Commission meeting, staff provided Commissioners with information on the status of the 1999-2000 Governor's Budget and its impact on the Commission. This information item provides an update on the recent legislative actions taken on the Commission's 1999-2000 budget.

FISCAL IMPACT ANALYSIS

The activities associated with the preparation and presentation of this item are included in the baseline budget for the Fiscal and Business Services Section. Therefore, no funding augmentation is needed for this item.

SUMMARY

Both houses of the Legislature adopted for inclusion in the final Budget Bill the Senate version of each of the items listed on the attachment, with the exception of the Assembly version of the proposed funding augmentation for the Paraprofessional Teacher Training Program.

Staff is available to answer any questions the Commissioners may have.

CALIFORNIA COMMISSION ON TEACHER CREDENTIALING 1999-2000 BUDGET BILL CONFERENCE COMMITTEE ITEMS

<i>Issue</i>	<i>Senate Version</i>	<i>Assembly Version</i>
New credential fee waiver as proposed in the January Governor's Budget	Approved \$1.5 million General Fund appropriation and rejected Trailer Bill language; expressed intent that the authority for the fee waiver should be included in separate legislation	Approved \$1.5 million General Fund appropriation and rejected Trailer Bill language
Independent evaluation of the Beginning Teacher Support and Assessment Program as proposed in the Governor's May Revision	Approved \$250,000 from the General Fund and \$250,000 from the Teacher Credentials Fund and adopted modified Budget Bill language to include California Department of Education (CDE) in a jointly managed evaluation effort	Approved \$500,000 from the General Fund and adopted the same modified Budget Bill language as approved by the Senate

Alternative Certification Program local assistance funding	Approved funding as proposed in the January Governor's Budget	Approved augmentation of \$7.3 million from the General Fund (Prop. 98) to fund an increase of \$1,500 to \$2,500 per intern as provided in AB 309 (Mazzoni)
Information technology projects	Approved augmentations of \$348,000 to fund the database and application upgrade project and \$161,000 to fund the agenda and web management project and adopted Budget Bill language to preclude the expenditure of these funds without the approval of the Department of Finance and the Department of Information Technology	Did not consider funding for these information technology projects
Paraprofessional Teacher Training Program	Approved augmented funding as proposed in the January Governor's Budget [\$6.6 million from the General Fund (Prop. 98) and \$3.4 million from Reimbursements (federal Goals 2000 via CDE)]	Approved augmented funding as follows: \$7.1 million from the General Fund (Prop. 98) and \$2.9 million from Reimbursements (federal Goals 2000 via CDE)
Mathematics Initiative	Adopted Budget Bill language in both state operations and local assistance items to provide that expenditure of funds must conform to legislation enacted during the 1999-2000 Regular Session	Did not adopt the Budget Bill language that was adopted by the Senate

| [Back to the Top](#) |

| [Back to July 1999 Agenda](#)



| [Return to "Agenda Archives"](#) |

| [Return to "About CTC"](#) |





California Commission on Teacher Credentialing

Meeting of: July 7-8, 1999

Agenda Item Number: FPPC-2

Committee: Fiscal Planning and Policy

Title: Proposed 2000-20001 Budget Change Proposal Concepts

✓ Action

Prepared by: Karen Romo, Analyst

Fiscal and Business Services

BACKGROUND

Every summer the Commission is asked to consider Budget Change Proposals (BCPs) for inclusion in the Governor's Proposed Budget for the upcoming fiscal year. Historically, it has been the Commission's practice to review BCP concepts at the annual July Commission meeting. After considering the BCP concepts, Commissioners would direct staff to fully develop the BCP concepts that the Commission would like to act on at the following Commission meeting. The fully developed BCPs detail workload analysis, complete fiscal detail, and any extraordinary expenditure requests above and beyond the standard operating costs.

Consistent with past practices, staff is bringing a total of 14 BCP concepts forward for the Commission's consideration.

ISCAL IMPACT ANALYSIS

The activities associated with the preparation and presentation of this item are included in the baseline budget for the Fiscal and Business Services Section. Therefore, no funding augmentation is needed for this item.

SUMMARY

The BCP concepts for fiscal year 2000-2001 request a total of 18.5 positions and \$2,909,000. Of this total, \$1,959,000 is from the Teacher Credentials Fund (0407) and \$950,000 is from the Test Development and Administration Account (0408).

Please refer to the attached table for a summary of the proposed fiscal year 2000-2001 BCP concepts. Immediately following the table is a complete package reflecting a brief synopsis of each BCP concept.

SUMMARY OF PROPOSED FISCAL YEAR 2000-2001 BUDGET CHANGE PROPOSAL (BCP) CONCEPTS

Requesting Division/Office	Summary of Request	Estimated Costs		Number of Positions Requested
		407	408	
Certification, Assignment & Waivers	Augment staff for a night shift in the Information Services Telephone Response Unit	\$ 89,000		2.0
Certification, Assignment & Waivers	Contract for an external consultant--Feasibility Study Report for records imaging	24,000		0.0
Certification, Assignment & Waivers	Contract for an external consultant--Feasibility Study Report for automated mailing, sorting, and cashiering	15,000		0.0
Certification, Assignment &	Contract for outsourcing conversion of microfilm records	450,000		0.0

Waivers				
Certification, Assignment & Waivers	Increase expenditure authority to cover costs associated with accepting credit card payments for application and renewal fees	120,000		0.0
Certification, Assignment & Waivers	Increase expenditure authority to cover costs associated with a toll-free number to improve the level of information service to our customers	108,000		0.0
Certification, Assignment & Waivers*	Convert existing limited-term positions to permanent status effective July 1, 2000 to meet increased workload demands	261,000		5.5
Professional Services	Increase expenditure authority for contracted studies of CCTC's highest volume exams to ensure their continued validity on a five-year cycle: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Permanent increase in expenditure authority Additional one-time expenditure authority increase for FY 2000-2001 		\$ 350,000 600,000	0.0 0.0
Professional Services	Augment staff to manage CCTC's ongoing responsibilities in the shared governance of the statewide BTSA program and to oversee BTSA program reviews	\$ 214,000		3.0
Professional Services	Increase expenditure authority to obtain external assistance to conduct BTSA program reviews	200,000		0.0
Professional Practices	Augment staff to address an increased caseload	143,000		2.0
Executive	Augment staff to address increased workload	47,000		1.0
Governmental Relations	Augment staff to address increased workload	50,000		1.0
Human Resources and Internal Audits**	Augment staff to address the needs of the Internal Audits Unit	238,000		4.0
	Total FY 2000-2001	\$ 1,959,000	\$ 950,000	18.5
GRAND TOTAL FOR 407 AND 408 FUNDS		\$2,909,000		

*This request was approved by the Commission at the August 1998 meeting as a 1999-2000 Budget Change Proposal.

**This request was approved by the Commission at the April 1999 meeting as a 1999-2000 Spring Finance Letter Budget Change Proposal.

[Back to the Top](#) |
[Back to July 1999 Agenda](#) |
 [Return to "Agenda Archives"](#) |
[Return to "About CTC"](#) |





California Commission on Teacher Credentialing

Meeting of: July 7-8, 1999

Agenda Item Number: PREP-1

Committee: Preparation Standards

Title: Approval of Subject Matter Preparation Programs by Colleges and Universities and Accelerated Approval of Professional Preparation Programs

✓ **Action**

Prepared by: Larry Birch, Ed.D., Administrator
Professional Services Division

Approval of Subject Matter Preparation Programs by Colleges and Universities and Accelerated Approval of Professional Preparation Programs

Professional Services Division

June 14, 1999

Executive Summary

This item contains a listing of subject matter programs recommended for approval by the appropriate review panels, according to procedures adopted by the Commission. The item also contains a listing of professional preparation programs recommended for accelerated approval by the Commission.

Fiscal Impact Summary

The Professional Services Division is responsible for reviewing proposed preparation programs, consulting with external reviewers, as needed, and communicating with institutions and local education agencies about their program proposals. The Commission budget supports the costs of these activities. No augmentation of the budget will be needed for continuation of the program review and approval activities.

Recommendation

That the Commission approve the subject matter preparation programs recommended in this item and that the Commission grant accelerated approval to the professional preparation programs recommended in this item.

Background

Subject Matter Program Review Panels are responsible for the review of proposed subject matter preparation programs. This item contains a listing of subject matter programs recommended for approval since the last Commission meeting by the appropriate review panels, according to procedures adopted by the Commission. In addition, two accelerated internship programs are recommended for approval by staff according to procedures approved by the Commission

A. Summary Information on Single Subject Matter Preparation Programs Awaiting Commission Approval

For the following proposed preparation programs, each institution has responded fully to the Commission's standards and preconditions for subject matter preparation for Single Subject Teaching Credentials. Each of the programs has been reviewed thoroughly by the

Commission's Subject Matter Program Review Panels. The panels have determined that each program has met all applicable standards and preconditions established by the Commission and they are now recommended for approval.

Recommendation

That the Commission approve the following programs of subject matter preparation for Single Subject Teaching Credentials.

Languages Other Than English

- Pacific Union College (French, Spanish)
- San Francisco State University (Latin)
- University of La Verne (French, German, Spanish)

Music

- Chapman University
- Humboldt State University
- San Diego State University
- Simpson College

Physical Education

- California State Polytechnic University, Pomona
- Westmont College

Science

- California State University, San Bernardino (Biology, Chemistry, Geosciences, Physics)
- Humboldt State University (Geosciences)

B. Summary Information on Designated Subjects Special Subjects Driver Education and Training Subject Matter Preparation Programs Awaiting Commission Approval

For the following proposed preparation program, the institution has responded fully to the Commission's standards and preconditions for subject matter preparation for the Designated Subjects Special Subjects Teaching Credential in Driver Education and Training. The program has been reviewed thoroughly by the Commission's Subject Matter Program Review Panel. The panel has determined that the program has met all applicable standards and preconditions established by the Commission and it is now recommended for approval.

- University of California, Riverside

C. Accelerated Approval of Internship Programs

As part of the Class-Size Reduction Initiative, the Professional Services Division is responsible for the accelerated approval of new internship programs for teachers in grades K-3. The following programs have been submitted under the provisions made for the declaration of intent to provide a complete program proposal within six months of the date of approval. Staff recommends approval of the following programs:

- Concordia University - Multiple Subject CLAD Emphasis Internship Credential.
- Whittier College - Multiple Subject CLAD Emphasis Internship Credential.



California Commission on Teacher Credentialing

Meeting of: July 7-8, 1999

Agenda Item Number: PREP-2

Committee: Preparation Standards

Title: Report on the Distribution of Teaching Internship Grant Funds, 1999 - 2000; Preliminary Report on the Use of Grant Funds, 1998 - 1999 and Proposal for the Use of Carry-over Funds

✓ Action

Prepared by: Michael M. McKibbin, Ph.D., Consultant
Professional Services Division

**Report on the Distribution of Teaching Internship Grant
Funds for 1999-2000;
Preliminary Report on Use of Grant Funds in 1998-99 and
Proposal for the Use of Carry-Over Funds**

**Professional Services Division
June 11, 1999**

Executive Summary

Education Code Section 44384 authorizes the Executive Director of the to award funds to University Internship Programs and District Intern Programs. This statute requires the Executive Director of the Commission on Teacher Credentialing to award grant funds to alternative certification programs that recruit, prepare and support intern teachers in California public schools (K-12). \$11 million is available to provide grant funding to districts and universities to develop, expand, and improve teaching internship programs. Awards are based on the review and recommendation of evaluators of the submitted proposals. The reviewers have recommended 38 proposals receive grant funding. An additional to twenty-eight projects that will continue to be funded in the second year of their cycle. These projects will prepare and employ more than 7800 interns in 412 California school districts.

Teaching internships have grown significantly since it began six years ago. Internships are now available in all areas of the state where there are teacher shortages. The capacity for programs to assist each other has also grown.

This agenda item also summarizes the results of distribution of teaching internship grant funds for 1998-99. More than 4,300 interns served in California classrooms in the past year. These interns contribute to district's ability to meet their needs for teachers in hard to staff classrooms as well as to diversify California's classrooms.

Policy Issues to be Resolved

Shall the Commission affirm the actions of the Executive Director to award grant funding to award grants to the sixty-six teaching internship projects, accept the report of distribution of funds for 1998-99 and approve the use of funds to support teaching internship projects locally and regionally?

Fiscal Impact Summary

The current workplan and base budget for the Professional Services Division includes the funds to administer teaching internship grants.

Staff Recommendation

Staff recommends that the Commission accept this report, affirm the actions of the Executive Director to award grant funding to 66 Teaching Internship Grant Projects, and approve the use of teaching internship grant funds to provide local and regional support opportunities to grant projects.

Relationship to the Commission's Strategic Goals and Objectives

Goal One: To promote educational excellence in California schools

Goal Six: To work with schools of education and school districts to assure teacher quality

Enabling Legislation

On October 10, 1993, Governor Wilson signed AB 1161 (Quackenbush), which enacted Chapter 1147 of the Statutes of 1993. This statute requires the Executive Director of the Commission on Teacher Credentialing to award grant funds to alternative certification programs that recruit, prepare and support intern teachers in California public schools (K-12). AB 1161 defined alternative certification programs as *internship programs* in two categories. First, Education Code Section 44384 authorizes the Executive Director to award funds to *University Internship Programs* pursuant to the provisions of a 1967 statute. Second, 44384 authorizes the award of funds to *District Internship Programs* pursuant to a 1983 law. In AB 1161, lawmakers offered legislative and fiscal support for both kinds of *teaching internship programs*. In the enabling legislation, Education Code Section 44386 stipulates that

in no event shall the grant amount awarded to any school district or county office of education exceed one thousand five hundred dollars (\$1,500) per intern per year, except that the Commission may . . . provide a larger grant per intern per year, in hardship cases.

The enabling legislation also required that program participants match the amount in the teaching internship grant.

In 1993, the State Budget included an appropriation of \$2 million from the General Fund for teaching internship programs, beginning in the 1993-94 fiscal year. From 1993 to 1996, the annual State Budget included a continued appropriation of \$2 million from the General Fund for internships for beginning teachers. The Commission has, for six years, established policy guidelines and operational plans for the award of these funds, has overseen the grant award process, and has monitored the quality of funded internships for beginning teachers.

In February 1997, AB 18 (Mazzoni, Pringle) was passed and signed by the Governor. This bill, among other items, increased the size of teaching internship grants to \$6.5 million. The bill added to the list of areas of focus for the grants helping districts meet the needs for teachers caused by reducing class size. The Governor's Budget for fiscal year 1998-99 increased the Teaching Internship Grant Budget to \$11 million.

This year the Commission is sponsoring legislation (AB 309 Mazzoni) that would increase the per capita cap on teaching internship programs to \$2,500 per intern while leaving the matching funds requirement at \$1,500. Governor Davis's budget contains sufficient funds to allow the increase in the size of the grant.

Statutory Purposes of Alternative Certification (Teaching Internship) Programs

On several occasions, California lawmakers have taken action to encourage the growth of internship programs for new teachers. In 1967, they enacted the *Teacher Education Internship Act of 1967*, which continues to be effective as Sections 44450 through 44467 of the Education Code. In 1983, lawmakers enacted the *Hughes-Hart Education Reform Act* (Senate Bill 813), and established additional internships that are governed by Code Sections 44325 through 44329, and 44830.3. Then, in 1993, the *Alternative Teacher Certification Act of 1993* (AB 1161, Quackenbush) was passed, which established funding criteria for the two kinds of internships established previously, and AB 18 (Mazzoni, Pringle) expanded the program in 1997.

Taken together, the statutes have recognized several purposes for internship programs for beginning teachers, which are summarized below.

- (1) The first purpose of internship programs for new teachers is to expand the pool of qualified teachers by attracting persons into teaching who might not otherwise enter the classroom, and who bring some of the following attributes into teaching.
 - Are changing careers after gaining experience and maturity in military services, aerospace firms, defense-related businesses and other industries.

- Meet California's subject matter standards in the subjects in which the public schools have chronic and widespread shortages of qualified teachers.
 - Are committed to serve in geographic areas where schools have been under-staffed, including urban, rural and isolated regions of California.
 - Cannot afford traditional program costs, and who need access to systematic training programs so they can meet professional teaching credential standards.
 - Are committed to enter the field of special education, to serve California's growing population of students with handicapping conditions.
 - Possess the linguistic and cultural skills to teach the growing numbers of limited-English-proficient pupils in K-12 schools.
 - Are members of demographic groups that are under-represented in the teaching workforce.
- (2) While addressing these critical recruitment needs, the second purpose of teaching internships is to enable K-12 schools to respond immediately to pressing needs while providing professional preparation for interns that is as extensive and systematic as traditional programs, and that links education theory with classroom practice throughout each intern's preparation.
- (3) While addressing these recruitment and preparation needs, the third purpose of internships is to provide effective supervision and intensive support so each new intern's learning can be targeted to her/his needs, and so beginning teachers who are interns can extend, apply and refine what they learn about teaching in the course of their initial preparation.

Internship programs allow schools to place in classrooms those prospective teachers who want to put their energies directly into their jobs and "learn by doing." Educational agencies have offered internships to enable non-traditional candidates to enter the profession. The grant funds provide the means to extend access to those candidates who are not reached by conventional programs and options.

Internship programs blend theory and practice and provide ways for school districts to respond immediately to pressing teacher needs. Because these programs focus on specific groups of prospective teachers, they target their preparation and support services to the particular needs of each individual. Programs are designed to identify each intern's entry-level skills, and to concentrate on what he or she needs. Internships also provide opportunities for schools and districts to become more active participants in preparing teachers, in collaboration with accredited colleges and universities.

Prior Actions by the Commission

The Commission has sponsored four "cycles" of funded internship programs since the 1993-94 fiscal year. Each cycle has encompassed two fiscal years because many internship programs are two years long. The Commission has previously taken action to affirm grant awards in the 1993-94 and 1994-95 fiscal years, a second cycle of grant awards in the 1995-96 and 1996-97 fiscal years, a third cycle in 1997-98 and 1998-99 fiscal years, in June 1998 funds were awarded for the forth cycle (1998-2000), and in December 1998 the Commission approved the procedures for the fifth cycle of funding. This agenda item presents the distribution of fifth cycle funds for 1999-2001, as well as a summary of preliminary data on the results of fourth cycle funding.

First and Second Cycles of Local Assistance Grant Awards: FY 1993-5 and 1995-97

To begin the first cycle of funding, the Commission co-sponsored Assembly Bill 1161 (Quackenbush, 1993) with the Office of the Governor. While this bill moved through the Legislature, the Commission discussed an action plan for its implementation. The Commission adopted this plan in June 1993, which enabled the staff to implement the legislation promptly. The Commission's plan included proposal review criteria, which focused on the quality of preparation, assessment and support services that would be delivered to interns. As soon as Governor Wilson signed the State Budget in 1993, the Professional Services Division began the process of distributing the allocated funds. Announcement of the availability of funds was sent to every school district and every university in the state.

In addition to meeting the purposes listed above the Alternative Certification Grant Program has also been used to meet other priorities. For example, in 1994 by Executive Order Governor Wilson initiated the *California Aerospace and Defense Workers Corps* and used the Alternative Certification program as the mechanism to affect the Executive Order. The purpose of the Corps was to attract persons who were dislocated because of cutbacks in aerospace and defense industries into teaching. This recruitment objective proved to be one of the most significant challenges in the alternative certification program, primarily because small numbers of scientists, engineers and mathematicians regard teaching as an appealing choice for their second careers.

Because the funds were subject to Proposition 98 restrictions, only school districts and county offices of education were eligible to receive grants. Many of the funded programs were initiated and led by colleges and universities, however, in partnership with districts and counties. In several other cases, postsecondary institutions were active partners in programs initiated by districts and counties. Every program that requested funds to recruit from aerospace, defense-related and military sources was funded. Every program that requested funds to fill mathematics and science teaching vacancies was funded. Programs served both urban areas and some of California's most remote areas. In addition to elementary and

secondary teachers, grant recipients also included teachers in one of California's greatest shortage areas, special education. All programs provided instructional, support and assessment services designed to assure that interns would be successful in very difficult teaching settings.

In 1995, based on the Commission-adopted plan, two new Requests for Proposals were distributed for a second cycle of programs. Programs that had previously received grants were invited to request "continuation grants." The sponsors of the first cohort of programs received a "Continuation RFP" for their response. Meanwhile, the Professional Services Division distributed a different RFP to all school districts, county offices, colleges and universities who had shown an interest in internships that had not participated in the first cycle.

More than 2,600 interns were prepared in the first two cycles. These interns taught in 178 districts in 38 counties. More than 300 of these interns came to teaching after careers in the armed services or the aerospace industry. Two-thirds of the participants had a previous career before becoming a teacher.

Third Cycle of Local Assistance Grant Awards: FY 1996-98

Beginning in 1996, Governor Wilson's Class Size Reduction Initiative substantially increased the demand for K-3 teachers. To help school districts meet this demand, the Commission took a series of policy actions in August and October, 1996. On February 6, 1997, Governor Wilson signed Assembly Bill 18 (Mazzoni, Pringle), which added \$4.5 million dollars from the General Fund to the Commission's budget specifically for the purpose of expanding internship programs for the Class Size Reduction Initiative. The augmentation legislation retained the original purposes of internships, and created two additional purposes.

- (1) Facilitate the reduction of class size in kindergarten and grades one to three.
- (2) Improve reading and mathematics instruction in the reduced classes that are taught by interns in the funded programs.

To contribute to the success of Class Size Reduction, the RFP asked the sponsors of programs to include specific preparation and support in the management of classes with twenty or fewer students in the primary grades. The funding provided through this RFP is focused on helping school districts meet the need for teachers as a result of the Class Size Reduction Initiative. One of the purposes of this initiative is to improve mathematics and reading instruction. In each proposal those requesting grant funds were required to provide a description of the curriculum that interns will receive that will provide the skills and knowledge to teach reading and mathematics.

More than 3,600 interns successfully completed their teaching assignment in the third cycle of grant programs. The majority of the interns continue to enter teaching after a career in another profession. Forty-five percent of the interns are from groups underrepresented in the teaching force. One third of the elementary teachers are males. Twelve percent of the interns are teaching in departmentalized in secondary or middle schools; fourteen percent are serving in special education classrooms.

Fourth Cycle of Local Assistance Grant Awards: FY 1998-2000

In June 1998, the Commission received the report on the Fourth Cycle RFP. Fifty-eight teaching internship projects were funded. These 58 projects pledged to prepare more than 5,700 intern teachers. Those teachers began serving students in the fall semester. More than 330 school districts are co-sponsors of those grant proposals. Districts in forty-one of California's fifty-eight counties are participating. The last section of this agenda item provides preliminary data from teaching internship projects in 1998-99. A final report on the teaching internship activities will be presented at a later date after each program's annual report is analyzed.

1999 (Fifth Cycle) RFP

As directed by the Commission at its December 1998 meeting, staff issued a Teaching Internship Request for Proposals (RFP) on January 15, 1999, 1,400 RFP were distributed. The recipients included the Dean or Director of Teacher Education at every college or university with an approved teacher preparation program. Every school district and county office of education, and anyone who had asked to be put on our RFP mailing list. The RFP was also placed on the Commission's Website. Staff conducted two bidders conferences and responded to numerous calls and Email questions about the RFP. All of these communications were communicated to all who submitted an intent to bid form. Staff received 42 Intent to Bid forms.

On or before the proposal deadline staff received 38 responses to the RFP. Staff also received requests from five of the continuing programs to amend their fourth cycle grant to prepare more interns than they had proposed in their 1998 grant request.

Review Procedures of Teaching Internship Proposals in 1999

Review Process for RFP's

Proposed teaching internship projects that were received were reviewed by evaluators including teachers and interns, district administrators, university educators, intern program coordinators, and Commission staff members. The names of those who served as reviewers are listed in [Table 1](#).

The funding criteria that were described in the RFP and used by the evaluators examine nine areas which are listed below.

- Demonstrated Need and Rationale for the Program
- Description of Participants to be Served, and Recruitment Efforts, and Selection Processes
- Geographic Distribution of Proposals
- Quality of Curriculum in the Program, Including the Quality of Reading and Mathematics Instruction
- Quality of Instructional Staff in the Program,
- Quality of Support Provided
- Quality of Selection and Preparation of Support Providers
- Quality of Assessment of Each Intern's Performance
- Quality of Program Evaluation Plan
- Budget for the Proposed Program
- Cost-Effectiveness of the Proposed Program

Before proposals were evaluated, the Commission's Staff conducted a training session for the reviewers. The session included an overview of the purposes of the program, a detailed explanation and discussion of the funding criteria (as listed above), and a collective review of two proposals to assure inter-rater reliability. Rating the first common proposal was the last activity of the training day. At the end of the training day, each member was given four additional proposals and score sheets. The task of each member was to read and score those programs they had received. One week later the reviewers reconvened. The first activity was to divide into teams and review the second common proposal. Following the team review, all twenty-seven readers met to review the common proposal and work out any needed protocols and reliability issues. For the remainder of the day the teams analyzed the proposals that they had read and scored individually, and arrived at a consensus score for each proposal.

Table 1
Evaluators of 1999 Teaching Internship Proposals

Name	Affiliation
Don Beauregard	CSU Fresno
Rachael Chavez	Long Beach USD
Celeste Debois-Flax	Oakland USD
Joan Ellis	Fresno COE
Pat Estrellas	UCLA Extension
Lillie Ford	CCTC
Chris Fruzza	West Contra Costa USD
Howard Giblin	CCTC
Diana Grijalva	San Diego USD
Helen Hawley	CCTC
Marie Hegwer-Divita	CSU Long Beach
Christina Kimm	CSU Los Angeles
Christian Kueng	Ontario-Montclair School District
Yolando Mercado	New Haven Unified School District
Pat Mette	CCTC
Lyn Nichols	New Haven Unified School District
Yvonne Novelli	CCTC
Jim O'Laughlin	New Haven Unified School District
Orobo Osagie	Berkeley Unified School District
Janice Phelps	Los Angeles Unified School District
Steve Price	CSU Fresno
Erin Hailey-Rodriguez	UC Santa Cruz
Sharon Russell	CSU Dominguez Hills
Fedela Santiago	San Diego Unified School District

David Stronk	CSU Hayward
Suzanne Sullivan	New Haven Unified School District
Janie Wardlow	San Diego Unified School District
Andrea Zetlin	CSU Los Angeles

In addition to giving a numeric score to each proposal, each team was asked to give a rating to each proposal. The five grades are as follows.

- 1) Superior proposal, no concerns
- 2) High quality, need for clarifications in a few areas
- 3) Good proposal, fund if team's substantive concerns are addressed
- 4) Fund this first year proposal as a pilot project if team's substantive concerns are addressed and provide assistance to project
- 5) Proposal does not meet minimum standards of quality

Among the most important tasks of the reviewers is to develop a list of questions for each project as necessary. Some of the questions are for clarification purposes, while others raise substantive concerns including asking questions that would require a program revision to answer the question. In the week following the review staff faxed to each project the list of questions and allowed ten days for the proposed program's administrators to formulate the answers. A phone interview was arranged with all 38 programs that sought funding to discuss the answers to the questions. The ability to provide satisfactory answers to the questions determines the level of funding for that project that staff proposes to the Executive Director.

Programs that have previously received grants are required to resubmit a response to the Request for Proposals every two years. Over the six years of the funding program eighty percent of the programs have chosen to renew their grants. This year five of thirty previously funded programs chose not to request funding for this cycle.

Programs that are in the middle of the two year cycle are allowed to request an augmentation to their grant if they find that the demand for interns is greater than they had originally predicted. The process for requesting the augmentation is simpler than responding to a full RFP. Program Directors submit a request outlining the circumstances that caused them to need a budget augmentation. They describe any changes they plan on making in their original proposal. They respond to any new requirements in the RFP, and submit a new proposed budget. Five programs requested amendments to their second year funding. These requests are reviewed by the Project Officer and were recommended to the Executive Director for funding.

1999-2000 Teaching Internship Funding

Eleven million dollars is available in the 1998-99 budget for funding Teaching Internship programs. \$214,500 was used to fund programs from the previous cycle, leaving \$10,784,500 available for funding 1999-2000 projects. In addition to new funding that is available, because this is a program that funds grants on a per capita basis, those projects that are unable to prepare the number of interns that they pledged to prepare are asked to carry-over funds. Those funds are available to fund interns in this fiscal year. More than \$ 1.8 million dollars are available to projects in carry-over funds. [Table 2](#) presents a summary of the number of interns that projects have pledged to prepare in 1999-2000. [Table 3](#) presents detailed information on the funds that were allocated to each of the projects, the amount of carry-over funds, and the number of interns that each project has pledged to prepare.

Table 2
Participation Totals
Teaching Interns 1999-2000

Districts and County Offices of Education 412 (of 996)

California Colleges and Universities 36 (of 75)

California Counties 43 (of 58)

Type of Program	California State University	University of California	Private and Independent College or University	District Intern	Total
Renewing	1447	15	233	162	1857
Continuing	2080	203	130	2142	4555
New	1279	40	192	0	1511
Total	4806	258	555	2304	7923
Percent of Total	60.6%	3.2%	7.1%	29%	

There are a total of sixty-six teaching internship projects. This is an increase of eight projects. There are thirteen new projects. There are twenty-five projects who are requesting funds to renew their grants. Twenty-eight projects are continuing into the second year of the two year grant cycle. The projects have pledged to prepare more than 7,800 interns. This is an increase of more than 2,000 interns above the previous year's pledges. Two more counties are represented in the grant programs. This leaves fifteen counties that do not have a grant program. In most of these non-participating counties representatives state that they do not hire teachers without full credentials to the extent that would warrant developing an internship program. In a few other cases, such as Inyo and Mono counties, project developers held discussions with Commission staff about instituting an intern or pre-intern program. After those discussions it was decided that participants were better suited for a pre-intern program. Last month the Commission approved their participation in the Riverside Pre-Intern Program. Staff looks forward to their participation in the internship grant program next year or the year following.

Table 3

Program Name	Total Interns	98-99 Carry over/Transfer	99-2000 Intern Allotment	99-2000 Total	New Project Subsidy	Regional Center	Regional Participation	99-2000 Grant Allocation
Renewing Projects								
Orange County Special Education	60	\$ -	\$ 90,000	\$ 90,000	\$ -		\$ 3,000	\$ 93,000
San Francisco Secondary Teaching	45	\$ 4,500	\$ 63,000	\$ 67,500	\$ -		\$ 3,000	\$ 66,000
Ventura County Multiple Subject	90	\$ 39,000	\$ 96,000	\$ 135,000	\$ -		\$ 3,000	\$ 99,000
San Joaquin District Intern (IMPACT)	115	\$ 99,000	\$ 73,500	\$ 172,500	\$ -		\$ 3,000	\$ 76,500
San Juan Unified School District	52	\$ 61,500	\$ 16,500	\$ 78,000	\$ -		\$ 3,000	\$ 19,500
South Placer County Consortium	8	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -			\$ -
Galt/Lodi District Consortium	2	\$ 7,500	\$ -	\$ 7,500	\$ -			\$ -
CSU Stanislaus-Merced Consortium	33	\$ 4,500	\$ 45,000	\$ 49,500	\$ -	\$ 40,000	\$ 3,000	\$ 88,000
CSU Stanislaus-San Joaquin	62	\$ -	\$ 93,000	\$ 93,000	\$ -		\$ 3,000	\$ 96,000
Petaluma/Sonoma State	2	\$ 10,500	\$ -	\$ 10,500	\$ -			\$ -
CSU Los Angeles	17	\$ 25,500	\$ -	\$ 25,500	\$ -			\$ -
Santa Clara University	42	\$ 16,500	\$ 46,500	\$ 63,000	\$ 1,000		\$ 3,000	\$ 50,500
Pasadena Unified School District	55	\$ 36,000	\$ 45,500	\$ 81,500	\$ -		\$ 3,000	\$ 48,500
Compton Unified School District	47	\$ -	\$ 120,500	\$ 120,500	\$ -		\$ 3,000	\$ 123,500
CSU Northridge-LAUDS	84	\$ 28,500	\$ 97,500	\$ 126,000	\$ -		\$ 3,000	\$ 100,500
CSU Bakersfield	30	\$ 25,500	\$ 19,500	\$ 45,000	\$ -		\$ 3,000	\$ 22,500
San Gabriel Valley Consortium	175	\$ 157,000	\$ 104,500	\$ 161,500	\$ 1,000		\$ 3,000	\$ 108,500
San Francisco Unified Elementary	60	\$ 21,000	\$ 69,000	\$ 90,000	\$ -		\$ 3,000	\$ 72,000
CSU Chico/Shasta	40	\$ -	\$ 66,000	\$ 66,000	\$ -		\$ 3,000	\$ 69,000
San Jose State Elementary	90	\$ -	\$ 135,000	\$ 135,000	\$ -	\$ 40,000	\$ 3,000	\$ 178,000
San Diego Unified Secondary	15	\$ -	\$ 22,500	\$ 22,500	\$ -		\$ 3,000	\$ 25,500
The Long Beach Partnership	95	\$ 90,000	\$ 51,500	\$ 141,500	\$ -	\$ 40,000	\$ 3,000	\$ 94,500
Alameda County Office of Education	70	\$ 6,000	\$ 99,000	\$ 105,000	\$ -		\$ 3,000	\$ 102,000
University of La Verne	0	\$ 42,000	\$ -	\$ 42,000	\$ -			\$ -
Oakland USD/JFK University	16	\$ -	\$ 24,000	\$ 24,000	\$ -		\$ 3,000	\$ 27,000
San Diego Elementary	42	\$ 12,000	\$ 51,000	\$ 63,000	\$ 1,000		\$ 3,000	\$ 55,000
CSU Long Beach	64	\$ 57,000	\$ 39,000	\$ 96,000	\$ -		\$ 3,000	\$ 42,000
Sacramento City USD	88	\$ 10,500	\$ 131,500	\$ 142,000	\$ -	\$ 40,000	\$ 3,000	\$ 174,500
CSU Northridge-Los Angeles USD	178	\$ 135,000	\$ 132,000	\$ 267,000	\$ -		\$ 3,000	\$ 135,000
Riverside COE-CSU San Bernardino	180	\$ 60,000	\$ 210,000	\$ 270,000	\$ -		\$ 3,000	\$ 213,000

Program Name	Total Interns	98-99 Carry over/Transfer	99-2000 Intern Allotment	99-2000 Total	New Project Subsidy	Regional Center	Regional Participation	99-2000 Grant Allocation
Continuing Projects (Second Year)								
Alum Rock Union Elementary	110	\$ -	\$ 165,000	\$ 165,000	\$ -		\$ 3,000	\$ 168,000
San Joaquin County Office of Education	57	\$ 15,000	\$ 70,500	\$ 85,500	\$ -		\$ 3,000	\$ 73,500
Orange County Department of Education District Intern	60	\$ 45,000	\$ 45,000	\$ 90,000	\$ 1,000		\$ 3,000	\$ 49,000
U. C. Santa Cruz	60	\$ 15,000	\$ 75,000	\$ 90,000	\$ -		\$ 3,000	\$ 78,000
Pacific Oaks College	20	\$ -	\$ 30,000	\$ 30,000	\$ -		\$ 3,000	\$ 33,000
The Long Beach Urban Science Teacher Project	0	\$ 15,000	\$ -	\$ 15,000	\$ -			\$ -

Alhambra/CSULA/LAUSD Special Ed.	90	\$ 15,000	\$ 130,000	\$ 145,000	\$ 1,000		\$ 3,000	\$ 134,000
CSU Long Beach/Long Beach USD Special Education	30	\$ -	\$ 45,000	\$ 45,000	\$ -		\$ 3,000	\$ 48,000
Foundation of CSU Monterey Bay	125	\$ 33,500	\$ 154,000	\$ 187,500	\$ -		\$ 3,000	\$ 157,000
Cal State Teach Intern Proposal	1000		\$ 1,500,000	\$ 1,500,000	\$ 1,000		\$ 3,000	\$ 1,504,000
California Lutheran University	36		\$ 54,000	\$ 54,000	\$ 1,000		\$ 3,000	\$ 58,000
Concordia University Intern	25		\$ 37,500	\$ 37,500	\$ 1,000		\$ 3,000	\$ 41,500
SDSU Imperial Valley Campus	60		\$ 90,000	\$ 90,000	\$ 1,000		\$ 3,000	\$ 94,000
Kings County Office of Education	50		\$ 75,000	\$ 75,000	\$ 1,000		\$ 3,000	\$ 79,000
Santa Clara COE/Silicon Valley	50		\$ 75,000	\$ 75,000	\$ 1,000		\$ 3,000	\$ 79,000
Tulare County Office of Education	30		\$ 45,000	\$ 45,000	\$ 1,000		\$ 3,000	\$ 49,000
UCLA CENTREX	40		\$ 60,000	\$ 60,000	\$ 1,000		\$ 3,000	\$ 64,000
Whittier College	25		\$ 37,500	\$ 37,500	\$ 1,000		\$ 3,000	\$ 41,500
San Jose State University Secondary	70		\$ 105,000	\$ 105,000	\$ 1,000		\$ 3,000	\$ 109,000
Saugus Union School District	60		\$ 90,000	\$ 90,000	\$ 1,000		\$ 3,000	\$ 94,000
Lake Elsinore/I-15	25		\$ 37,500	\$ 37,500	\$ 1,000		\$ 3,000	\$ 41,500
Chico/Yuba Certification Committee	40		\$ 60,000	\$ 60,000	\$ 1,000		\$ 3,000	\$ 64,000

Program Name	Total Interns	98-99 Carry over/Transfer	99-2000 Intern Allotment	99-2000 Total	New Project Subsidy	Regional Center	Regional Participation	99-2000 Grant Allocation
Continuing Projects (Multiple Cycles)								
Northeastern California Partnership for Special Education	80		\$ 142,500	\$ 142,500	\$ -		\$ 3,000	\$ 145,500
Project Pipeline District Intern	136		\$ 204,000	\$ 204,000	\$ -		\$ 3,000	\$ 207,000
CSU Fullerton	70	\$ 77,500	\$ 27,500	\$ 105,000	\$ 1,000		\$ 3,000	\$ 31,500
CSU Fresno	113	\$ 244,000	\$ -	\$ 244,000	\$ 1,000			\$ 1,000
Imperial County SELPA	33	\$ 7,000	\$ 42,000	\$ 49,000	\$ 1,000		\$ 3,000	\$ 46,000
Los Angeles USD- (LISTOS)	1758	\$ 238,500	\$ 2,398,500	\$ 2,637,000	\$ -	\$ 40,000	\$ 3,000	\$2,441,500
New Haven MS & SS Partnership Program	45	\$ 45,000	\$ 22,500	\$ 67,500	\$ 1,000		\$ 3,000	\$ 26,500
Oakland USD/CSU Hayward Partnership	319	\$ 18,000	\$ 460,500	\$ 478,500	\$ -		\$ 3,000	\$ 463,500
San Bernardino/Riverside County-Mild/Moderate Disabilities	52	\$ -	\$ 78,000	\$ 78,000	\$ -		\$ 3,000	\$ 81,000
Long Beach Alternative Certification Program (District Intern)	48	\$ -	\$ 72,000	\$ 72,000	\$ -		\$ 3,000	\$ 75,000
CSU Dominguez Hills Alternative Teacher Certification Program	670	\$ 78,000	\$ 927,000	\$ 1,005,000	\$ -		\$ 3,000	\$ 930,000
The Win Win Internship Consortium - Cal Poly Pomona	130	\$ -	\$ 217,500	\$ 217,500		\$ 40,000	\$ 3,000	\$ 260,500
Bilingual Education Credential Alternative (BECA) District Intern	76	\$ 25,500	\$ 88,500	\$ 114,000	\$ -	\$ 40,000	\$ 3,000	\$ 131,500
Elk Grove USD	31	\$ -	\$ 49,500	\$ 49,500	\$ -		\$ 3,000	\$ 52,500
CSU Northridge Special Education	85	\$ 18,000	\$ 114,500	\$ 132,500	\$ -		\$ 3,000	\$ 117,500
Ontario/Montclair School District	64	\$ -	\$ 96,000	\$ 96,000	\$ 1,000		\$ 3,000	\$ 100,000
West Contra Costa USD	150	\$ -	\$ 225,000	\$ 225,000	\$ -		\$ 3,000	\$ 228,000
UCLA Extension Urban Intern Credential Program	87	\$ -	\$ 130,500	\$ 130,500	\$ 1,000		\$ 3,000	\$ 134,500
UC Berkeley Extension	56	\$ 13,500	\$ 70,500	\$ 84,000	\$ -		\$ 3,000	\$ 73,500
Total	7923	\$ 1,852,500	\$10,289,000	\$12,141,500	\$ 24,000	\$280,000	\$ 192,000	\$10,785,500

Table 4
Alphabetical List of School Districts and County Offices of Education
to Co-Sponsor Teaching Internships in the Fourth Funding Cycle

(Numbers in parentheses indicate how many funded internships the LEA is involved in. Those agencies that have been added in the fifth cycle of funding appear in *italics*.)

ABC Unified School District
 Adelanto School District
 Alameda County Office of Education **(2)**
 Alameda Unified School District
 Alhambra School District **(2)**
 Alisal Union School District
 Alpaugh Unified School District
 Alta Loma School District **(4)**
 Alum Rock Union ESD **(2)**
[Alta Vista Elementary School District](#)
 Alview-Dairyland ESD
 Alvina School District
[Alvord School District](#)
 Anaheim City District **(4)**
[Anaheim Union High School District](#)
 Antelope Valley SELPA
[Antelope Valley Union High School District](#)
 Apple Valley Unified School District **(2)**
[Armona Elementary School District](#)
 Arcadia School District
 Atwater Elementary School District
 Azusa Unified School District **(6)**

Baker Valley Unified School District
 Bakersfield City School District
 Baldwin Park Unified School District **(3)**
 Ballico-Cressey Elementary School District
 Banta Elementary School District
 Bangor Unified School District
 Barstow Unified School District
 Bass Lake Joint Union ESD
 Bassett Unified School District
 Bellflower Unified School District **(2)**
 Berkeley Unified School District **(2)**
 Berryessa Union School District
 Big Springs Union Elementary School District
 Biggs Unified School District
 Bonita School District
[Bonsall Union School District](#)
 Brea-Olinda Unified School District **(2)**
[Briggs School District \(2\)](#)
[Browns Elementary School District](#)
[Buena Vista Elementary School District](#)
 Burbank School District
 Burnt Ranch School District

[Burton Elementary School District](#)
 Butte County Office of Education **(2)**
 Butte Valley Unified School District
[Butterville Elementary School District](#)

[California Youth Authority \(6\)](#)
[Cambrian School District](#)
 Campbell Union Elementary School District
[Campbell Union High School District](#)
 Capistrano Unified School District
 Cascade Union Elementary School District
 Castro Valley Unified School District
[Cayucos Elementary School District](#)
 Center Unified School District
 Central School District **(3)**
 Central Unified School District
 Central Union School District **(2)**
 Centralia School District **(2)**
 Ceres Unified School District
 Chaffey Joint Union High School District
[Chatom Unified School District](#)
 Charter Oak Unified School District
 Chico Unified School District
 Chino Unified School District **(2)**
 Chowchilla Elementary School District
 Chualar School District
 Claremont Unified School District **(3)**
 Cloverdale Unified School District
 Clovis Unified School District
 Coachella Valley Joint Unified School Dist.
 Coalinga-Huron School District
 Colton Joint Unified School District
 Colton Unified School District **(2)**
 Colusa County Office of Education
[Colusa Unified School District](#)
 Compton Unified School District
 Corona Norco Joint Unified School District **(2)**
 Corona-Norco Unified School District **(3)**
[Corning Union Elementary School District](#)
[Cottonwood Union School District](#)
 Covina Valley Unified School District **(2)**
 Cucamonga Unified School District **(2)**
 Cupertino Union School District
 Cutler-Orosi Unified School District **(2)**

Davis Joint Unified School District

Table 4 (Continued): Co-Sponsoring Local Education Agencies

[Delano Unified School District](#)
 Delhi Unified School District
 Delta Island Union Elementary District
[Delta View Joint Union School District](#)
 Desert Sands Unified School District
 Dinuba Unified School District **(2)**
 Dos Palos-Oro Loma Joint USD
 Dos Palos/Loma Joint Unified School District
 Douglas City Elementary School District
 Downey Unified School District **(2)**
 Dry Creek Joint Union School District
 Duarte Unified School District **(2)**
 Dunsmuir High School District
 Dunsmuir Joint Union High School District

Earlimart School District (3)
 East Whittier School District
 Eastside School District
[Eastside High School District](#)
 Elk Grove Unified School District
 El Monte School District
[El Rancho Unified School District \(2\)](#)

Glendora Unified School District
 Glenn County Office of Education **(2)**
 Golden Feather Union School District
 Golden Plains Unified School District
 Gonzales Unified School District
 Grant Joint Union High School District **(3)**
 Greenfield Unified School District
 Grenada Elementary School District
 Gridley Union High School District
 Gridley Elementary Union School District
[Gustine Unified School District](#)

Hacienda-La Puente USD (4)
[Hamilton Union High School District](#)
 Hanford Elementary School District **(2)**
 Hanford Union High School **(2)**
 Happy Camp Elementary School **(2)**
 Hayward Unified School District **(2)**
 Hemet Unified School District
 Hesperia Unified School District
[Hilmar Unified School District](#)
 Holt Union Elementary School District
 Hueneme School District

Emery Unified School District (2)	Hughson Unified School District
Enterprise School District	Humboldt County Office of Education
Escalon Unified School District(2)	
Etiwanda School District (2)	Imperial County Office of Education
Etna Union Elementary School District	Inglewood Unified School District
Etna Union High School District	Irvine Unified School District
Eureka City School District	Island Union School District
Eureka Union School District	
Evergreen School District	Janesville Union School District (2)
Exeter Union Elementary	Jefferson Elementary School District
	Junction School District
Fallbrook Union Elementary School District	Jurupa Unified School District
Farmersville Unified School District	
Fillmore Unified School District	Kelseyville Unified School District
Firebaugh-Las Deltas Unified	Keppel Union School District
Folsom-Cordova Unified School District	Kerman Unified School District
Fontana Unified School District (3)	Kern County Superintendent of Schools
Foresthill Union School District	Keys Elementary School District
Forks of Salmon School District	Kings Canyon Unified School District
Fort Jones Union Elementary School District	King City School District (2)
Fountain Valley School District	Kit Carson Union School District
Fremont Unified School District (3)	
Fremont Union High School District	La Habra City School District (2)
Fresno County Office of Education	Lake Elementary School District
Fresno Unified School District (2)	Lake Elsinore Unified School District (2)
Fullerton School District (2)	Lake Tahoe Unified School District
	Lammersville Elementary School District
Galt Joint Union ESD (2)	Lamont School District
Garden Grove Unified School District (2)	Lancaster Elementary School District
Garvey School District (2)	Lassen County Office of Education (2)
Gilroy Unified School District	Lassen Union High School District
Glendale Unified School District	Layton Unified School District
	Le Grand Union School District

Table 4 (Continued): Co-Sponsoring Local Education Agencies

Lemoore Union Elementary High School	Murrieta Unified School District (2)
Lemoore Union High School (2)	
Lewiston Elementary School	Natomas School District
Liberty School District (2)	New Haven Unified School District
Lincoln Unified School District (2)	New Hope Elementary School District
Linden Unified School District (2)	New Jerusalem Elementary School District
Lindsay Unified School District (2)	Newark Unified School District (2)
Little Lake City School District	Newman-Crows Landing Unified School Dist.
Live Oak Unified School District	
Livingston Union School District	Newport-Mesa School District
Lodi Unified School District (3)	North Monterey Unified School District
Lompoc Unified School District	North Sacramento School District
Long Beach Unified School District (8)	Norwalk La Mirada Unified School Dist. (6)
Los Angeles County Office of Education (2)	Nuestro Elementary School District (2)
Los Angeles Unified School District (9)	Nuvview Union School District
Los Banos Unified School District	
Lowell Joint School District	Oakdale Joint School District
	Oak Grove School District
Magnolia School District	Oak View Union ESD (3)
Manteca Unified School District	Oakland Unified School District (5)
Manton Joint Union School District (2)	Ocean View School District
Manteca Unified School District	Oceanside Unified School District
Manzanita Elemenatry School District (2)	Ojai Unified School District (2)
Marcum-Illinois Union School District (2)	Ontario-Montclair School District (3)
Mariposa County Unified School District	Orange Center School District
Marysville Unified School District (2)	Orange County Office of Education (3)
Maxwell Unified School District	Orange Unified School District (3)
McCloud Union School District	Orland Unified School District
McFarland Unified School District	Oro Grande School District
Mendota Unified School District	Oroville Elementary School District
Merced City Elementary School District	Oroville Union High School District
Merced County Office of Education (2)	Oxnard Elementary School District (2)
Meridian Elementary School District	Oxnard Union High School District
Mesa Union Elementary	
Milpitas Unified School District (3)	Pacheco Union School District
Modoc County Office of Education (2)	Pacific Unified School District

Monrovia School District	Pacific Grove School District
Monson-Sultana Joint Union District	Pajaro Valley School District
Montebello Unified School District (2)	<i>Palermo Union School District</i>
Monterey County Office of Education	<i>Palmdale School District</i>
Monterey Peninsula Unified School District	Palm Springs Unified School District
Moorpark Unified School District (2)	Palo Verde Unified School District (2)
Moreland School District	Paradise Unified School District (2)
Moreno Valley Unified School District	Paramount Unified School District (2)
Moroc Joint Unified School District	Pasadena Unified School District
Morongo Unified School District	<i>Paso Robles Joint Unified School District</i>
Mountain View School District (2)	Patterson Joint Unified School District
Mt Diablo Unified School District	Perris Elementary School District
Mt View School District (El Monte)	Petaluma City Elementary School District
Mt. Shasta Union School District (2)	Piedmont Unified School District
Mt. View School District (Ontario)	<i>Pierce Joint Union School District (2)</i>
Mountain View High School District	<i>Pioneer Union School District</i>
	Pittsburg Unified School District (2)
	Pixley Union School District (2)
	Placentia-Yorba LindaUSD (3)

Table 4 (Continued): Co-Sponsoring Local Education Agencies

<i>Placer County Office of Education</i>	
Planada School District	
<i>Pleasant Grove Joint Unified School District</i>	
Pleasant Valley School District (2)	<i>San Lucas Union School District</i>
Pleasanton Unified School District	Sanger Unified School District
Plumas County Office of Education	Santa Ana Unified School District (4)
Plumas Unified School District (2)	Santa Clara Unified School District (3)
Pomona Unified School District	Santa Cruz City School District
Porterville Unified School District (2)	<i>Santa Cruz County Office of Education</i>
	<i>Saugus Union School District</i>
Raisin City School District	Selma Unified School District
Red Bluff Union High School District	Shasta County Office of Education (2)
Redding School District	Shasta Union High School District
Redlands Unified School District (2)	Simi Valley Unified School District
<i>Reef Sunset Unified School District</i>	Siskiyou County Office of Education (2)
Rialto Unified School District (3)	<i>Snowline Joint Unified School District</i>
Richfield Elementary School	<i>Sojourn School (Charter School)</i>
Richgrove School District	Soledad Unified School District
<i>Rim of the World Unified</i>	Somis Union Elementary District (2)
Rio School District (2)	Sonoma Valley Unified School District
Ripon Unified School District	South Pasadena School District
Riverbank Elementary School District (2)	South Whittier School District
Riverdale Joint Union ESD	Stanislaus County Office of Education (2)
Riverside County SELPA	Stockton Unified School District (2)
Riverside Unified School District (2)	Stone Corral School District
Robla School District	<i>Sundale Union Elementary School District</i>
Rocklin Unified School District	Surprise Valley Joint Unified School District
Rohner Park-Cotati Unified School District	Susanville School District
<i>Romoland School District</i>	Sutter County Office of Education (2)
Roseland School District (2)	
Rosemead School District	Tehama County Office of Education (2)
Roseville City School District	<i>Temecula Valley Union School District</i>
<i>Round Valley Unified School District</i>	Thermalito Union School District
Rowland Unified School District (4)	Tracy Elementary School District
	<i>Trinity Center Elementary School District</i>
Sacramento City Unified School District (2)	Trinity County Office of Education (2)
Sacramento County Office of Education	Tulare City Schools
Saddleback Valley USD (3)	Tulelake School District
<i>Salida Unified School District</i>	<i>Tustin Unified School District</i>
Salinas City School District	<i>Twin Ridges Elementary School District</i>
Salinas Union High School District	
San Benito County Office of Education	Upland Unified School District (2)
San Bernardino City Unified School District	
	Val Verde Unified School District (2)
	Vallejo City School District
	Ventura County Superintendent of Schools (2)
	Ventura Unified School District (2)
	Victor Elementary School District

San Bernardino County Supt. of Schools	Walnut Valley Unified School District (2)
San Diego City Schools (3)	<i>Wasco Union School District</i>
San Diego County Office of Education (2)	Washington Colony School District
San Francisco Unified School District (2)	Washington Unified School District
San Jacinto Unified School District	<i>Waterford Unified School District (2)</i>
San Juan Unified School District	Weed Union Elementary School District
San Joaquin County Office of Education (3)	West Contra Costa Unified School District
<i>San Jose Unified School District</i>	West Covina School District (2)
San Leandro Unified School District	
San Lorenzo Unified School District	

Table 4 (Continued): Co-Sponsoring Local Education Agencies

West End SELPA	<i>Wilsona School District</i>
West Fresno School District	Winton Elementary School District
West Valley High	Wisman School District
Western Placer Unified School District	<i>Woodlake Union Elementary School District</i>
Westminster School District (2)	Woodville Union School District (2)
Westside Elementary School District	
Westwood Unified School District	Yreka Union High School District (2)
Wheatland School District	<i>Yuba City Unified School District (2)</i>
Whittier City School District (2)	Yuba County Office of Education
	Yucaipa-Calimesa Joint USD

There are four new university participants in the teaching internship program. Three are private and independent colleges or universities and one is an additional University of California campus.. All but three of the California State Universities are participating in teaching internship programs. One program at Sonoma State University chose not to renew their grant and instead will participate with CALTEACH, the CSU Systemwide effort. With UCLA becoming a participant, half of the University of California campuses are participants. Approximately one quarter of the private and independent colleges are participants. There are eight projects that are district internships. None is new this cycle.

Table 5
Accredited Colleges and Universities Participating as Lead Sponsors or Co-Sponsors of Funded Teaching Internship Programs

Azusa Pacific University	<i>Concordia University</i>
California Lutheran University (2)	<i>Fresno Pacific University (2)</i>
California State Poly University, Pomona	John F. Kennedy University
California State University, Bakersfield	National Hispanic University
California State University, Chico (3)	Pacific Oaks University
California State University, Dominguez Hills (3)	San Diego State University
California State University, Hayward (2)	San Francisco State University (2)
California State University, Fresno (2)	San Jose State University (3)
California State University, Fullerton (3)	Santa Clara University
California State University, Long Beach (3)	Sonoma State University
California State University, Los Angeles (2)	University of California, Berkeley
California State University, Monterey Bay	University of California, Irvine
California State University, Northridge (2)	<i>University of California, Los Angeles Extension</i>
California State University, Sacramento (5)	University of California, Los Angeles
California State University, San Bernardino (2)	University of California, San Diego
California State University, San Marcos (2)	University of California, Santa Cruz
California State University, Stanislaus (2)	University of La Verne
Chapman University	<i>Whittier College</i>

Table 6
Local Education Agencies that Sponsor State-Funded District Internship Programs

- Compton Unified School District
- Long Beach Unified School District
- Los Angeles Unified School District
- Project Pipeline Consortium (21 Districts)
- Ontario-Montclair Elementary School District
- Orange County Office of Education
- San Joaquin County Offices of Education Consortium (13 Districts)

Proposal of a New Funding Strand

Staff proposes that carry-over funds be used in ways that will further enhance individual programs as well as expand the number of interns that will be prepared in the next year. First, carry-over funds allow for more interns to be funded in the 1999-2000 fiscal year. The carry-over funds also allow projects to support each other in ways that have not been available before. For example, staff proposes that each new project be paired with a veteran project to provide ongoing 'mentoring'. Staff recommends that \$1,000 be allotted to cover the costs of the partnering activity.

Finally, because the program has grown to the size that it is, the Commission Staff can no longer provide as much ongoing assistance as was possible when there were fewer programs. It is also clear from the annual reports there is a wealth of expertise residing in the individual projects.

Staff proposes that a mechanism for sharing that expertise should be developed. Staff proposes that funds be set aside to provide opportunities for collaboration among teaching internship grant projects. Staff proposes that seven regional support networks be created. Each network would include approximately ten projects from the immediate geographical region. Seven projects would be designated as the support facilitator for a region. Funds to support the activities of the region would be housed in that project's budget. Each project would receive a stipend to cover the costs of their participation in the activities of the region. The activities of the region would be determined by its members with overall approval by the project officer for teaching internship programs.

In no case will fewer interns be prepared because the funds have been reallocated to project support activities. All of the project's requests for funding for 1999-2000 were met before funds were allocated for support opportunities.

Preliminary Data from 1998-99 Teaching Internship Grant Program

Each year Teaching Internship Grant projects are required to submit annual reports describing the activities and progress for that year. The report is received in three parts. The first part provides numeric information on the number of interns prepared and demographic data about those interns. This section of this agenda item presents those data. The second portion of the annual report provides a narrative description of each project's activities. Those reports are due to the Commission staff on June 30 and will be the subject of an agenda report in the fall. An example of such a report is last year's *Voices and Views, Perspectives on California's Teaching Internship Programs* that was sent to Commissioner's as a Friday mailing last year and is available upon request. The final portion of the annual report is the budget report.

When the fifty-eight teaching internship responded to the 1998 Request for Proposals, they pledged to prepare more than 5,700 interns. Thirty-six of fifty eight projects were not able to prepare the number of interns that they thought they would, and were required to carry-over funds. Overall the projects prepared 78% of the interns that they pledged to prepare. Although the number of intern teachers is less than projected, 4,333 teachers was the target for \$6.6 million in grant at \$1,500 per intern of funding.

Table 7, 8, and 9 present demographic data about the interns in programs in 1998-99. Table 7 provides information about the jobs, if any, that interns held prior to becoming an intern. As in earlier years more than three-quarters of the interns were employed in other occupations before they became interns. The number that have entered teaching after positions in the military or aerospace industries is approximately the same as the prior year. This number is less than staff had hoped. This is at least in part due to efforts by both of these recruitment sources to keep their membership rather than efforts in earlier years to help those who wanted to transition into teaching. The greatest increase is in the number of paraprofessionals who are becoming teachers through internships. There are 165 more former paraprofessionals who are now interns than last year. This is a nearly 50% increase over last year. As might be expected, the largest group of interns are those moving from emergency permits. The number of emergency permit holders becoming interns is nearly the same as last year.

Table 7
Recruitment Source of Teaching Interns

Military	Aero-space	Other Business & Industries	Social Services	College & University	Para-professionals	Emergency Permit Holders	Other Teaching	Other	Un-known	Total
38	48	400	159	946	490	1697	218	164	160	4320
0.9%	1.1%	9.3%	3.7%	21.9%	11.3%	39.3%	5.0%	3.8%	3.7%	100%

Forty-five per cent of interns are from ethnic and racial groups that are underrepresented in the teaching workforce. This is virtually the same as the prior year. This number is more than twice the number of underrepresented teacher candidates in traditional (student teaching based) teacher preparation programs. The numbers for each group remain approximately the same. The only exception is a slight increase in the number of Asian interns and a slight decrease in the number of Hispanic interns.

Sixty-nine percent of those participating in intern programs are female. This is consistent with earlier years. One of the goals of the program is to increase the number of male teachers in elementary schools. This year 29% of the elementary

interns are male. This is similar to last year. This figure is approximately three times the number of males in elementary classrooms statewide.

Table 8
Composition of Teaching Internship Cadre

African American	American Indian	Asian (Chinese, Japanese, Korean, Southeast Asia)	Filipino/Pacific Islander	Hispanic	White/Non-Hispanic	Multiple	Other	Unknown	Total
297	29	325	85	1011	2386	41	29	118	4321
7%	1%	7%	2%	23%	55%	1%	1%	3%	100%

The grades, subjects, and credential areas of interns remains approximately the same as last year (See Table 9). There was slight increase of teachers in middle schools and a slight decrease of interns in grant programs in high school and special education programs. As last year nearly half of the interns in the programs are in class size reduced classes. Science teacher interns are the largest group in departmentalized classrooms.

Table 9
Grade Levels, Subjects and Credentials of Teaching Interns-1998-99

Elementary					
Type	K-3 CSR	K-3 Non-CSR	4 th -6 th	Other	Total
Continuing Programs	1429	363	333	14	2139
Renewing Programs	628	48	234	28	938
Sub-total	2057	411	567	42	3077
Percentage of Total Interns	47.5%	9.5%	13%	.9%	71%

High School						
Type	Science	Math	Social Studies	English/ Language Arts	Other	Total
Continuing Programs	64	44	41	105	34	288
Renewing Programs	25	21	6	14	26	92
Sub-total	89	65	47	119	60	380
Percentage of Total Interns	2%	1.5%	1%	2.7%	1.4%	8.8%

Middle School							
Type	Core or Self contained	Science	Math	Social Studies	English/ Language Arts	Other	Total
Continuing Programs	108	53	36	7	48	12	264
Renewing Programs	54	18	7	5	10	5	99
Sub-total	162	71	43	12	58	17	363
Percentage of							

	3.7%	1.6%	1%	.2%	1.3%	.4%	8.3%
--	------	------	----	-----	------	-----	-------------

Special Education						
Type	Learning Handicapped Mild/Moderate	Severely Handicapped Moderate/Severe	Resource Specialist	Other	Total	Grand TOTAL
Continuing Programs	327	66	57	4	454	3145
Renewing Programs	15	12	28	0	55	1184
Sub-total	342	78	85	4	509	4329
Percentage of Total Interns	7.9%	1.8%	1.9%	.09%	11.8%	

Summary

Teaching internship continue to be one of the most important means that California is using to meet the need for teachers. The teachers bring rich experiences with them and provide diversity proportionally higher than traditional teacher preparation programs. Internships provide more males for elementary schools, more persons from ethnic and racial groups underrepresented in the teaching workforce, and more teachers who bring rich workplace experiences into California's classrooms after working in other areas.

Internships continue to grow at a rapid rate. In 1998-99 internships grew by sixteen percent. If projects are able to meet their pledges, the program will grow more than thirty per cent in 1999-2000. The number of districts who are participating in internships grew by twenty per cent, and the new programs reaching into some new areas of the state.

The program continues to meet the goals set by the Legislature and the Commission. The program has expanded the pool of qualified teachers by attracting persons into teaching who might not otherwise enter the classroom. The program has allowed more than three hundred districts to respond immediately to pressing needs for teachers. These interns are able to put their energies directly into their jobs and "learn by doing." Teaching internships allow districts and universities to become partners in teacher preparation to provide high quality, theory based, practically applied instruction, effective supervision, and intensive support so each new intern's learning can be targeted to her/his needs. Educational agencies have offered internships to enable non-traditional candidates to enter the profession. The grant funds provide the means to extend access to those candidates who are not reached by conventional programs and options.

In the six years that the Teaching Internship Program has been in operation growth has occurred in other ways. The expertise about internships and how to make these programs thrive has grown significantly. The program has grown so that there is a 'critical mass' of local and regional expertise so that project personnel can share and support each other in ways that would not have been possible earlier. If this program continues to have high expectations and if through the grants that are distributed districts and colleges and universities provide high quality, focused preparation, then teaching internships will continue to make a significant contribution to workforce of teachers for the state of California.



[| Back to the Top |](#)
[| Back to July 1999 Agenda](#)
[| Return to "Agenda Archives" |](#)
[| Return to "About CTC" |](#)





California Commission on Teacher Credentialing

Meeting of: July 7-8, 1999

Agenda Item Number: PREP-3

Committee: Preparation Standards

Title: Consideration of Extension of a Waiver of Regional Accreditation for National Hispanic University

✓ Action

Prepared by: Dennis S. Tierney, Ph.D., Director
Professional Services Division

Consideration of Extension of a Waiver of Regional Accreditation for National Hispanic University

Professional Services Division
California Commission on Teacher Credentialing
June 16, 1999

Overview of this Report

This report provides: (1) background information about the decision of the Commission in November, 1994 to grant a limited-term waiver of regional accreditation to National Hispanic University, the extension of the waiver in October, 1997, the report on the progress that National Hispanic University had made toward full regional accreditation by August, 1998 and the subsequent Commission decision based on that report, and, (2) two options for the Commission to consider regarding the request for a continuation of this waiver. The summary report of the accreditation team that visited National Hispanic University in May, 1999 is attached to this agenda item.

Policy Issue To Be Resolved

Should the Commission continue the waiver of regional accreditation requested by National Hispanic University, and, if so, for what length of time and under what conditions?

Fiscal Impact Analysis

All of the options and recommendations in this report can be funded from the base budget of the Professional Services Division.

Staff Recommendation

Since the Committee on Accreditation will not take action until after the date of the Commission's agenda cut-off, staff makes no recommendation at this time, but will present an in-folder update and recommendation following the Committee on Accreditation meeting.

Background Information

In November, 1994, the Commission on Teacher Credentialing granted to National Hispanic University a limited-term waiver of the legal requirement that a California college or university be regionally accredited by the Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC) as a condition of eligibility to offer programs leading to teacher certification in California. The legal requirement of regional accreditation appears in several sections of the Education Code, most prominently Section 44259, which states in part:

44259. (b) The minimum requirements for the preliminary multiple or single subject teaching credential are all of the following:

- (1) A baccalaureate degree . . . from a regionally accredited institution of postsecondary education.

For California, the regional accrediting body for institutions of postsecondary education is the Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC).

In addition to the restrictions imposed by state law, the Commission has previously adopted policies regarding regional accreditation. The following paragraph is transcribed from the *Policy Manual*, Commission on Teacher Credentialing, Part II, Chapter 2, Article 1, Section 1120 (May, 1992):

1120. Approval Limited to WASC Accredited Institutions Except Designated Subjects.

Except for Designated Subjects Credentials, the Commission shall accept preparation program applications only from institutions granting baccalaureate and/or graduate level academic credit and that are accredited by the Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC), the latter which has been approved by the Council on Postsecondary Accreditation and the United States Department of Education.

On February 4, 1994, the Commission adopted the following additional policy as recommended by the Preparation Standards Committee.

Credentials which require the completion of a baccalaureate or higher degree will be granted only to individuals who have attained the baccalaureate degree or higher degree from a regionally accredited college or university.

In sum, postsecondary education institutions in California must have achieved accreditation from the Western Association of Schools and Colleges (the re-gional accrediting body for California) for (1) the acceptance of baccalaureate or higher degrees that are required for the award of professional credentials, and (2) the evaluation and accreditation of preparation programs that must be completed to qualify for professional credentials.

In November, 1994, the Commission also reviewed and adopted policies on future requests to waive the regional accreditation requirement. The adopted policy consists of the following four principles.

- (1) Waivers are temporary and are intended to mitigate the adverse impact of credential requirements by providing additional time for individuals to meet those requirements, and;
- (2) Waivers are granted to enable educational institutions to achieve goals established by the state, and;
- (3) Waivers are permissible if the outcome of such a waiver will provide significant help in addressing identified critical needs of schools and school children, and;
- (4) Waivers are permissible if there are accompanying mechanisms for assuring that Commission standards are not lowered and that quality of preparation is maintained under the waiver provisions.

In addition, the Commission decided to adopt, as expected elements of any future request, the seven conditions that were suggested by National Hispanic University in its request for a temporary waiver of regional accreditation. The seven conditions are as follows.

- (1) All baccalaureate degree graduates from NHU who seek Multiple Subject Credentials will take and pass the Multiple Subjects Assessment for Teaching before being admitted to the BCLAD program. NHU will submit its Liberal Studies program for review by the Commission. Should it receive approval, only those NHU graduates in Liberal Studies will be exempt from the MSAT.
- (2) Candidates pursuing Single Subject Teaching Credentials will take and pass the appropriate subject matter examinations before being admitted to the BCLAD credential program.
- (3) For admission to the BCLAD program, all candidates will be required to have a satisfactory grade-point average of 3.0 in undergraduate studies.
- (4) All courses that are prerequisite to admission to the BCLAD program must be completed before candidates enroll in the program.
- (5) To be admitted to the BCLAD program, all candidates will be required to pass a bilingual entrance examination at the 2.0 level of language proficiency on the Foreign Service Institute (FSI) scale. To be recommended for BCLAD credentials, all candidates must achieve an FSI level of 3.0 in Spanish language proficiency.
- (6) The Commission will appoint a visiting team to review the teacher preparation programs at NHU after the second year of the waiver. The team will submit a written report of its findings to the Commission and the Committee on Accreditation. An extension of the waiver beyond three years will be considered only if the team finds that all applicable standards are fully met.
- (7) Within the three-year period, NHU will have achieved candidate status under the WASC standards as a condition for any consideration of a waiver extension.

Based on the four principles and seven conditions noted above, the Commission granted to National Hispanic University a

three-year limited-term waiver of the requirement that colleges and universities hold WASC accreditation or have approval from WASC before they can submit programs of professional preparation or academic degree programs leading to teacher certification.

Progress Report of Fall, 1997

In the agenda report prepared for the October, 1997 Commission meeting, staff noted that National Hispanic University had made significant progress toward meeting the seven conditions that it proposed -- and the Commission accepted -- in its initial waiver request. The University's key accomplishments included the following.

- (1) The University's professional preparation programs for Multiple Subject BCLAD Teaching Credentials and Multiple Subject BCLAD Internship Credentials were reviewed in relation to the current standards of the Commission, and were approved by the Commission in August, 1995.
- (2) The University's Subject Matter (Liberal Studies) Program for Multiple Subject Credentials was initially reviewed in February, 1996, and was recommended for approval at the Commission's October, 1997, meeting.
- (3) National Hispanic University was scheduled for its first site visit for professional accreditation by the Committee on Accreditation in the Spring of 1998. Preliminary discussions with the institution regarding this visit took place in March of 1996.
- (4) The Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC) conducted its evaluation visit at National Hispanic University in October, 1996. Following is a factual summary of WASC's findings in October, 1996.
 - (4- WASC decided to request an additional report by NHU regarding seven areas of concern that were brought to A) WASC's attention by the evaluation team.
 - (4- The WASC evaluation team also recommended that the University be reviewed by a small visiting team during a B) follow-up visit to the University in the Spring of 1998, after the University responds to the evaluation team's original concerns.
 - (4- WASC deferred action on the University's application for candidacy until June 30, 1998, in order to provide C) additional time for NHU to develop the information that WASC requested.
 - (4- WASC reported its evaluation findings to National Hispanic University on June 27, 1997. After reviewing these D) findings, WASC's Executive Director indicated that WASC believed candidacy for accreditation (and eventual accreditation) was attainable by National Hispanic University.

The policy issue that the Commission on Teacher Credentialing faced at its October, 1997 meeting was:

Given that the Western Association of Schools and Colleges has not advanced National Hispanic University to candidacy status within three years of the waiver granted by the Commission, does the Commission wish to grant a one-year extension of its limited-term waiver to allow National Hispanic University the opportunity to meet the additional requirements that have recently been set by WASC?

After careful deliberation, the Commission voted to accord National Hispanic University one additional year to achieve candidacy (to July, 1998) and further agreed to postpone the planned accreditation site visit until after the issue of candidacy for accreditation had been settled.

August 1998 Decision

On July 9, 1998, Dr. Swofford received a letter from President B. Roberto Cruz announcing that the Western Association of Schools and Colleges had voted to advance National Hispanic University to candidacy for accreditation at its June 25, 1998 meeting. With such approval, students at National Hispanic University may transfer college credits to other WASC accredited institutions. NHU was also provided with a five (5) year period to meet all standards for accreditation.

In that same letter, Dr. Cruz indicated that NHU would like to schedule its delayed accreditation site visit for May of 1999 so that they might prepare adequately for the site visit of their credential programs.

On August 5, 1998, Dr. Cruz submitted a packet of information regarding their desire to have the waiver extended for five years. The packet (Appendix B) submitted by the institution includes other information about NHU activities.

Relevant Policy Question

The relevant policy questions before the Commission were as follows.

- (1) Does the Commission wish to provide a second waiver of its requirement of regional accreditation to National Hispanic University, and, if so;
- (2) does it wish to set the length of the second waiver at a time period equal to that provided by WASC (five years) or less?

Staff Analysis Done for the August 1998 Request

The University met all but two of the conditions and requirements established by the Commission in its 1994 decision within the original time frame. Items six and seven of the 1994 conditions were not met on time as NHU did not achieve candidacy within three years and did not, therefore, have its accreditation site visit as planned in 1997. The Commission granted NHU a one year extension and delayed the accreditation site visit until the WASC decision was rendered. With the matter of candidacy decided, the institution is now preparing for its planned site visit scheduled for May, 1999. This site visit will ensure that the Commission's standards of program quality and effectiveness are being met and will provide the Commission with valuable information about these programs. To decline the request for any continuation of the waiver at this time will force the university to close its credential programs and its Liberal Studies program before any actual site visit has taken place. Given the continuing need for qualified educators, and the institution's record of steady progress in meeting the accreditation requirements of the Western Association of Schools and Colleges, declining to continue the waiver seems counter-productive to the goals of the Commission and ignores the progress made by the institution since 1994. Thus, staff believes that a continuation of the waiver of regional accreditation is warranted.

If the Commission concurs with staff analysis that a continuation of the waiver of regional accreditation is both consistent with the goals of the Commission and supported by the progress of the institution in the past four years, the second question to be addressed is the length of that waiver. The Commission has two options regarding the length of the waiver it could grant.

Option One for the August 1998 Request

One option is to grant a waiver equal to the five year time period granted to the institution by WASC to achieve accreditation. This option acknowledges the past progress of the institution in meeting WASC expectations and does not require additional reports of the institution. This option also reflects a belief that the Commission's own professional accreditation process provides sufficient quality assurances regarding the professional education programs. The institution is scheduled for a full accreditation site visit in May, 1999. This visit will include not only the specific credential program standards, but also the eight Common Standards that address overall institutional support for the credential programs. Since the institution has no more than one year to address any stipulations imposed by the Committee on Accreditation, any concerns raised as a result of the visit must be addressed within that time frame.

Option Two for the August 1998 Request

The second option limits the continuation of the waiver to one year, and makes any additional waiver extension dependent on the outcome of the planned accreditation site visit in May, 1999. This option is in keeping with item six of the 1994 Conditions which required that all applicable standards must be fully met if the institution was to receive an extension of the waiver beyond the original three years. If the Commission decides to maintain this condition in the new waiver, the outcome of the Committee on Accreditation's decision would be reported to the Commission as a separate agenda item and become evidence in the Commission's consideration of a waiver beyond 1999. This option provides the Commission with more detailed information about National Hispanic University's performance than option one and provides additional decision points to the Commission in considering the continuation of the waiver. It requires more staff and Commission time to prepare and review such reports and places a greater burden on the institution in that representatives may wish to appear before the Commission and the institution will likely want to introduce evidence to the agenda items staff will prepare. This option represents a higher level of oversight than option one.

Staff Recommendation for the August 1998 Request

Staff believes that the reasons the Commission granted the original waiver in 1994 still hold and that National Hispanic University has complied with virtually all of the conditions imposed on them in the original request. WASC has indicated its support for the growth and development of the institution, and National Hispanic University is forging greater connections to other institutions of post-secondary education in the South Bay Area. While candidacy status does not confer any obligation toward accreditation, students at NHU may now transfer college credits to accredited institutions. Thus, staff believes that NHU has met its promises to the Commission and deserves a continuation of its waiver.

Staff further recommends that the Commission grant the waiver for only one year as this option is in keeping with the conditions of the original waiver. Item six of the 1994 waiver agreement indicated that an extension of the waiver beyond the original three years would be considered only if the accreditation team found that all applicable standards were fully met. If the Commission wishes to continue the stance taken in 1994, a one year waiver (1998 - 99) would provide the time necessary to conduct a review and to report the action of the Committee on Accreditation to the Commission in July, 1999. Based on the outcome of that accreditation decision, the Commission could choose to deny the extension of the waiver, grant the extension of the waiver, or grant a modified waiver of some type. This option provides the Commission with a greater degree of control than option one.

The Commission voted to accept staff recommendation of Option Two and granted National Hispanic University a one-year waiver of regional accreditation to permit an accreditation site visit in May, 1999. The Commission further agreed that it would review the case for additional time on the waiver of regional accreditation in July, 1999 after the site visit was concluded and that it would utilize the accreditation team's report in its deliberations.

July 1999 Request

The second one-year extension of the requirement for regional accreditation for National Hispanic University will lapse at the end of July, 1999. The accreditation visit to National Hispanic University took place, as scheduled, during the week of

May 23-26, 1999. Dr. Larry Birch, Administrator for Accreditation, served as the staff consultant for that visit. Because the institution's credential program is small, a three-person team was assembled to conduct the visit. The team concluded its visit and prepared the attached report for review and consideration by the Committee on Accreditation (COA). The COA is scheduled to meet on June 24 and 25, 1999, one day after the agenda cutoff for the July Commission meeting. Since the team report is a statement of findings on standards and a recommendation on accreditation to the Committee on Accreditation, formal action on the team report will not take place until after the Commission's agenda cutoff date occurs. Thus, the actual decision of the COA will be appended to this report as an in-folder item. The Committee on Accreditation may elect to accept the team recommendation or it may choose another accreditation decision.

Commission Options Regarding the Continuation of the Waiver

1. Option One

The Commission on Teacher Credentialing could elect to hold National Hispanic University to the letter of Condition Six which reads, "The Commission will appoint a visiting team to review the teacher preparation programs at NHU after the second year of the waiver. The team will submit a written report of its findings to the Commission and the Committee on Accreditation. An extension of the waiver beyond three years will be considered only if the team finds that all applicable standards are fully met." The Commission has already granted NHU some relief from this condition in that the review of its teacher preparation program did not take place in 1997, but was delayed until 1999 because of the Commission's actions in 1997 and 1998. For the purpose of this agenda item, the relevant sentence is the last sentence in Condition Six, "An extension of the waiver beyond three years will be considered only if the team finds that all applicable standards are fully met." The accreditation team report indicates that not all standards were fully met and the team is recommending "Accreditation with Substantive Stipulations." Under this option, the Commission would deny an extension of the waiver of regional accreditation and the University would be required to close its credential program, arrange for its continuing students to transfer to another accredited teacher education program, and also notify its undergraduate students that the Liberal Studies subject matter preparation program no longer meets the requirements for multiple subject academic preparation.

2. Option Two

Option Two would take into consideration the overall judgement of the team and provide the University with one additional year to demonstrate that it can provide the necessary support for its credential programs and, thus, meet fully all the standards required of it. This option differentiates between those weaknesses in programs that lead to concerns about candidate knowledge and candidate performance in public schools and those weaknesses that lead to concerns about institutional organization or institutional stability. It provides one more opportunity for the institution to attend to all of the Commission's standards for program quality and effectiveness.

Attached Report of the Accreditation Team

The actual team report as presented to the Committee on Accreditation (COA) follows. Commission staff will prepare an in-folder item that will update the Commission on the actions taken by the Committee on Accreditation and provide a staff recommendation based upon the decisions of the COA.

Recommendations by the Accreditation Team and Report of the Accreditation Visit for Professional Preparation Programs at National Hispanic University

Professional Services Division

June 9, 1999

Overview of This Report

This agenda report includes the findings of the Accreditation Team visit conducted at National Hispanic University. The report of the team presents the findings based upon reading the Institutional Self-Study Reports, review of supporting documentation and interviews with representative constituencies. On the basis of the report, an accreditation recommendation is made for the institution.

Accreditation Recommendations

- (1) The Team recommends that, based on the attached Accreditation Team Report, the Committee on Accreditation make the following accreditation decision for National Hispanic University and both of its credential programs:

ACCREDITATION WITH SUBSTANTIVE STIPULATIONS

Following are the stipulations:

- That the institution provide evidence of the active involvement of the faculty in the governance of the program. The involvement must include sufficient full-time faculty to maintain effective coordination and management of the program.

- That the institution provide evidence of a comprehensive program evaluation system, involving the required constituencies, that collects data, analyzes it, and uses the information gathered for program changes and improvement, as needed.
- That the institution provide evidence of the implementation of systematic procedures for the selection, orientation and evaluation of all master teachers.
- That the institution provide evidence of a clearly articulated program design based upon a conceptual framework which explains the rationale for the delivery system.
- That the institution provide evidence of a clear and focused incorporation of English Language Development (ELD) and Specially Designed Academic Instruction in English (SDAIE) instructional strategies throughout the program.
- That the institution provide evidence of a comprehensive and cohesive process of guidance, assistance and feedback for student teachers.
- That the institution provide evidence of the implementation of a final assessment process that is consistent with all of the elements of the standard.

On the basis of this recommendation, the institution is authorized to recommend candidates for the following Credentials:

Multiple Subject CLAD/BCLAD (Spanish) Emphasis
Multiple Subject CLAD/BCLAD (Spanish) Emphasis Internship

- (2) The team recommends that National Hispanic University provide evidence to the Committee on Accreditation that appropriate actions have been taken to address each of these stipulations within one year from the date of this action. A focused re-visit is recommended to verify the appropriate action in relation to all stipulations. In addition, the institution will provide an interim written report within six months of steps being taken to address the stipulations.
- (3) Staff recommends that:
 - The institution's response to the preconditions be accepted.
 - National Hispanic University not be permitted to propose new credential programs for approval by the Committee on Accreditation.
 - National Hispanic University not be placed on the schedule of accreditation visits until after the revisit.
 - All current and entering students be notified of the accreditation status of National Hispanic University with the Committee on Accreditation.

Background Information

National Hispanic University is an independent, non-profit, four-year institution of higher education. The institution was founded in 1981 to enable Hispanics, other minorities, women, and others to acquire an undergraduate degree or certificate using a multicultural educational experience to obtain a professional career in business, education, or technology. The institution was founded in Oakland and operated there and at a San Jose campus until 1994, when it relocated to a permanent 10 acre campus in East San Jose.

The institution offers Bachelor's degrees in Liberal Studies, Business Administration and Computer Science/Information Management. In addition to the Multiple Subject CLAD/BCLAD (Spanish) Emphasis professional preparation program, the institution has an Internship program with the Alum Rock Unified School District. Other special programs have been developed to meet the educational needs of the community. Certificate programs are available for CLAD/BCLAD. Additional certificate programs include the Child Development Certificate, Translation and Interpretation Certificate, and a Bilingual Medical Interpretation Program. There is also a General Education Development Test Preparation program, the El Nuevo Mundo Bilingual Children's Center, the Esperanza Educational Talent Search and the Upward Bound program.

In 1995, National Hispanic University was granted a waiver of the Western Association of School and College (WASC) accreditation requirement by the Commission on Teacher Credentialing. The waiver was granted on the condition that the University gain the status of candidacy with WASC. Candidate status was achieved in 1998.

Preparation for the Accreditation Visit

The Commission decided in August, 1998 that the institution was eligible to continue to offer its credential programs and scheduled a site visit for Spring 1999. A staff consultant was assigned to the institution shortly thereafter and met with institutional leadership initially in the Fall, including the program director and institutional administration. The meeting led to decisions about team size, team configuration, standards to be used, format for the institutional self-study report, interview schedule, logistical and organizational arrangements. In addition, telephone and regular mail communication was maintained between the staff consultant and institutional representatives. The Team Leader, Dr. Charles G. Zartman, Jr. was selected in November, 1998.

Preparation of the Institutional Self-Study Report

The Institutional Self-Study Report was prepared beginning with responses to the Common Standards. This was followed by responses to the Program Standards. The institution decided to use option one (California Program Standards) in the *Accreditation Framework* for the programs, Multiple Subject CLAD/BCLAD, including internship.

Selection and Composition of the Accreditation Team

Decisions about the structure and size of the team were made cooperatively between the Education Department chairperson, institutional administration and the Commission Consultant. It was agreed that there would be a team of three consisting of a Team Leader, and two team members. The Commission Consultant selected the team members to participate in the review. Team members were selected because of their expertise, experience, and adaptability, and trained in the use of the *Accreditation Framework*. All three team members had specific expertise in CLAD/BCLAD.

Intensive Evaluation of Program Data

Prior to the accreditation visit, team members received copies of the appropriate institutional report and information from Commission staff on how to prepare for the visit. The COA Team Leader and members examined the institution's responses to the Common Standards and the Program Standards. The on-site phase of the review began on Sunday, May 23, 1999. The team members arrived on Sunday afternoon and began their deliberations with one another. The team meeting included a review of the accreditation procedures and organizational arrangements for the team. This was followed by a reception sponsored by National Hispanic University to provide an orientation to the institution.

On Monday and Tuesday, May 24-25, the team collected data from interviews and reviewed institutional documents according to procedures outlined in the *Accreditation Handbook*. There was extensive consultation among the three team members with much sharing of information. On Sunday, Monday and Tuesday evenings the team had working dinners. During lunch on Monday and Tuesday team members shared data with each other that had been gathered from interviews and document review. The entire team met after dinner on Monday evening to discuss progress the first day and share information about findings. On Tuesday morning, the Team Leader met with the Department Chair and the Provost to provide early notification of areas in which the team was seeking additional information. The formal mid-visit status report was provided for the institution early Tuesday afternoon. Institutional personnel did give the team some additional materials arising from the mid-visit status report. Tuesday evening and Wednesday morning were set aside for additional team meetings and the writing of the team report.

Preparation of the Accreditation Team Report

Pursuant to the *Accreditation Framework*, and the *Accreditation Handbook*, the team prepared a report using a narrative format. For each of the Common Standards, the team made a decision of "Standard Met" or "Standard Not Met." The team had the option of deciding that some of the Common Standards were "Met Minimally" with either Quantitative or Qualitative Concerns. The team then wrote specific narrative comments about each standard providing a finding or rationale for its decision and then outlining perceived Strengths or Concerns relative to the standard.

For the program areas, the team prepared a narrative report about the program standards which pointed out any standards that were not met or met minimally and included explanatory information about findings related to the program standards. The team highlighted specific Strengths and Concerns related to the program areas.

The team included some "Professional Comments" at the end of the report for consideration by the institution. These comments are to be considered as consultative advice from the team members, but are not binding on the institution. They are not considered as a part of the accreditation recommendation of the team.

Accreditation Decisions by the Team

After the report was drafted, the team met Wednesday morning for a final review of the report and a decision about the results of the visit. The team discussed each Common Standard and each Program Standard and decided on the basis of interviews and program documents that one Common Standard was not met and three were met minimally. Two Program Standards were not met and three were met minimally. The remainder of the standards were fully met.

The team made its accreditation recommendation based on its findings and the policies set forth in the *Accreditation Framework*. In its deliberations, the team decided that several standards in both Common and Program sections were worthy of being noted as areas of strength and in other cases, areas of concern. The team then decided on an accreditation decision for the institution. The options were: "Accreditation," "Accreditation with Technical Stipulations," "Accreditation with Substantive Stipulations" or "Denial of Accreditation." After thorough discussion, the team decided to recommend the status of "**Accreditation with Substantive Stipulations.**" The recommendation was based on the unanimous agreement of the team.

CALIFORNIA COMMISSION ON TEACHER CREDENTIALING COMMITTEE ON ACCREDITATION ACCREDITATION TEAM REPORT

Institution: National Hispanic University

Dates of Visit: May 24-26, 1999

Following are the stipulations:

- That the institution provide evidence of the active involvement of the faculty in the governance of the program. The involvement must include sufficient full-time faculty to maintain effective coordination and management of the program.
- That the institution provide evidence of a comprehensive program evaluation system, involving the required constituencies, that collects data, analyzes it, and uses the information gathered for program changes and improvement, as needed.
- That the institution provide evidence of the implementation of systematic procedures for the selection, orientation and evaluation of all master teachers.
- That the institution provide evidence of a clearly articulated program design based upon a conceptual framework which explains the rationale for the delivery system.
- That the institution provide evidence of a clear and focused incorporation of English Language Development (ELD) and Specially Designed Academic Instruction in English (SDAIE) instructional strategies throughout the program.
- That the institution provide evidence of a comprehensive and cohesive process of guidance, assistance and feedback for student teachers.
- That the institution provide evidence of the implementation of a final assessment process that is consistent with all of the elements of the standard.

Rationale:

team recommendation for Accreditation with Substantive Stipulations was the result of a review of the Institutional Self Study Report, a review of additional supporting documents available during the visit, and interviews with administrators, faculty, students, local school personnel and other individuals professionally associated with the unit. The decision pertaining to the accreditation status of the institution was based upon the following:

1. Common Standards - The Common Standards were first reviewed one by one and then voted upon by the entire team. Four standards were judged to have been met, three met minimally and one not met.
2. Program Standards - The Program Standards were first reviewed one by one and then voted upon by the entire team. Sixteen standards were judged to have been met, three met minimally and two not met.
3. Overall Recommendation - The decision to recommend Accreditation with Substantive Stipulations was, in part, based on team consensus that all although three standards were not met and six standards were met minimally, the institution should be able to appropriately address the concerns. The areas of concern are mostly centered around organizational and administrative issues. Although the concerns are serious and must receive careful attention by the institution, the team was of the opinion that the candidates are well prepared and comparable to candidates prepared by other institutions. Employers reported that the combined efforts of both NHU and the school districts are producing teachers prepared to serve all students. The institution has entered into partnerships with businesses, city government, the local state university and school districts. Further, the campus is located in a neighborhood context and appears to serve a local constituency. The team reached the decision that the overall evidence clearly supports the above accreditation recommendation.

Team Leader: Charles G. Zartman, Jr.
California State University, Chico

Team Member: Priscilla Walton
University of California, Santa Cruz

Team Member: Clara Chapala
California Department of Education

DATA SOURCES

	INTERVIEWS CONDUCTED		DOCUMENTS REVIEWED
15	Program Faculty	X	Catalog
2	Institutional Administration	X	Institutional Self Study
33	Candidates	X	Course Syllabi
15	Graduates	X	Candidate Files
8	Employers of Graduates	X	Fieldwork Handbook

5	Supervising Practitioners		Follow-up Survey Results
2	Advisors	X	Needs Analysis Results
12	School Administrators	X	Information Booklet
1	Credential Analyst	X	Field Experience Notebook
4	Advisory Committee	X	Schedule of Classes
6	Interns	X	Advisement Documents
1	School Board Member	X	Faculty Vitae
1	University Education Dean		Other
TOTAL 108			

Common Standards

Standard 1

Educational Leadership

Standard Met Minimally Quantitative Concerns

The National Hispanic University received waiver approval for offering a Multiple Subject CLAD/BCLAD program in 1994. The institution initiated an internship program in conjunction with the Alum Rock Union School District in 1998. The program has been developed to be consistent with the institutional mission which supports ". . . using a multi-cultural educational experience to obtain a professional career, . . ." through its emphasis on "high expectations to encourage academic success, a support system to enhance achievement, and role models to provide a success oriented attitude." The institution is located in a strategic geographic location. Under the leadership of the President, Provost and Teacher Education Director, the institution has demonstrated a consistent ability to attract and retain students who have previously given up on college. The institution has a growing presence in the region.

Though the program has experienced high faculty and staff turnover in recent years, steps have been taken to solidify the schedule of course offerings, clarify the focus of the program, involve the faculty in decision-making, and strengthen the program. Although the institutional mission and vision are clearly articulated on paper, and some positive steps to involve the largely adjunct faculty have been taken, the program has been operated mostly without the active involvement of faculty in its governance.

Strengths

The National Hispanic University administration recognizes that nearly eighty percent of the institutional full-time equivalent student base relates directly to teacher preparation.

NHU is committed to the expansion of its existing internship program to meet the staffing needs of the partner district. It offers a service delivery model that meets the needs of the students and other local school districts. The institution has, indeed, listened to its constituencies and made appropriate adjustments in response.

Concerns

No additional concerns noted.

Standard 2

Resources Standard

Met Minimally Quantitative Concerns

Within the last five years, significant steps have been taken to transform a former elementary school located on a ten acre parcel of land into a fully functioning institution of higher education. The vision for full build out of the campus is ambitious. The program of the institution has experienced rapid growth and now serves over 250 candidates with one full time faculty member, one recently selected full-time faculty member, six adjunct faculty members available to teach courses, two part-time field supervisors, and additional support personnel. The team gathered evidence through review of documents and interviews that this low distribution of full-time personnel makes it difficult to maintain effective coordination and management of the program.

Strengths

Program personnel have dedicated considerable professional effort to secure needed resources. A strong commitment has been demonstrated to make the most out of the institution's limited funding base.

Partnership agreements have been made with nearby universities and school districts to utilize library and other facilities and offer candidates access to materials that would otherwise be unavailable.

Candidates commented that, despite limited resources, institutional personnel provided dedicated attention to candidate's needs.

Concerns

No additional concerns noted.

Standard 3

Faculty

Standard Met

The faculty at NHU are fully qualified, both by academic training and professional experience, to deliver the professional preparation program at the institution. The faculty reflect a strong commitment to the mission of the university to provide a program that is responsive to the needs of the local community. All faculty have specific qualifications in their areas of expertise.

Strengths

The institution provides a variety of incentives to promote faculty development by the following:

- Providing a \$50 stipend for attending faculty meetings.
- Increasing the amount paid to instructors by \$500 for each class they teach if they attend all faculty development offerings.

The faculty are evaluated regularly through student evaluations. The Director of the program also reviews the performance of faculty. Those who do not evidence success in their teaching are not rehired to teach in the program.

Concerns

The instructional faculty is largely composed of adjunct hires. They are employed to teach specific modules in the program. A majority of faculty hold full time positions in other institutions or organizations. While there appears to be an incipient development of a "core" regular faculty, it is important that the institution obtain sufficient full time faculty to insure long term stability to the program.

Standard 4

Evaluation

Standard Not Met

There is no evidence of the existence of a comprehensive evaluation design and criteria, involving the required participants, that systematically collects data, analyzes it, and uses the information gathered for program change and improvement. For example, there is no evidence of the following:

- Formal information from graduates of the program
- Involvement of practitioners, such as master teachers, in providing feedback to the program.
- Faculty input into evaluation and development of the program.

There appear to be a number of instances in which the institution has responded to concerns. However, this information is received in an informal and unsystematic way and not as a part of a comprehensive system. The participation of districts in a more formal ongoing evaluation system of the program is not evident.

Students regularly evaluate the faculty. The results from these evaluations are used to make decisions about retention. It was not clear how the course evaluations are used to improve the content of instruction beyond the removal of unsuitable faculty.

Strengths

The various constituencies of the program believe that the institution is open and receptive to input.

The districts are eager to be full partners in all aspects of the program.

Concerns

None noted.

Standard 5

Admissions

Standard Met

The institution maintains very clear and explicit procedures and criteria for the admission process. A variety of evidence confirmed this. The evidence included:

- Information in the Student Handbook
- A series of documents and forms in the student folders which attested to multiple measures, such as transcripts, letter of reference, GPA's completion of legal requirements and necessary exams such as CBEST, MSAT, RICA, and Language Exams for Bilingual candidates.
- Personal interviews at application time.

Strengths

The institution is extremely successful in recruiting a diverse candidate pool. It has successfully recruited a large number of Latino candidates which is in keeping with its institutional mission and goals. It has also embraced other underrepresented groups as well as attracted non-minority students who are also committed to the vision of the university. The institution is largely recruiting from the local community and is seen as a neighborhood institution which is attracting candidates who represent the community and have a deep understanding of its educational needs.

All candidates are teaching on emergency permits or internship credentials. In the admission process, the institution clearly prioritizes the appropriate sequence of requirements needed by candidates and assist them in completion.

Concerns

None noted.

Standard 6**Advice and Assistance****Standard Met**

Candidates consistently reported that advisement and assistance was available from qualified staff. The institution provides specific information about program requirements through a student handbook, various bulletins and newsletters, and an advisement sheet specifying credential pathways. Candidates are able to obtain accurate information about individual completion of program and credential requirements.

Strengths

None noted

Concerns

Recent turnover of office support staff has resulted in uneven information provided for students about course schedule changes and other program revisions. However, efforts are underway to assist and train new staff to improve support services for students seeking credential program information.

Standard 7**School Collaboration****Standard Met**

School administrators reported having long-term involvement with NHU staff through the development of the internship program and other community-based activities that support the school community. The institution staff works closely with school district personnel to select school sites for field work experiences. Coordination of the internship program is a shared responsibility between school sites and the NHU. There have been recent staff changes in the field supervision component. However, there has been no discernible interruption of student supervision. Students and school site staff report more frequent school site visits to principals and more students observation with feedback that is constructive and helpful.

Strengths

None noted.

Concerns

None noted.

Standard 8**District Field Supervisors****Standard Met Minimally
With Qualitative Concerns**

The institution has memoranda of understanding with several school districts for student teacher placements and employment. However, the selection, orientation and evaluation of all Master Teachers is uneven. Some students reported effective support and interaction with Master Teachers. Others did not have Master Teacher supervision. The recent hiring of a faculty member to develop and coordinate student advisement and field placement should strengthen this component and assure that supervising staff will be appropriately selected, trained, evaluated and recognized.

Strengths

None noted.

Concerns

None noted.

**Multiple Subject: CLAD/BCLAD (Spanish) Emphasis
Multiple Subject: CLAD/BCLAD (Spanish) Emphasis Internship****Findings on Standards**

After review of the institutional self-study and supporting documentation as well as completion of interviews with candidates, faculty, graduates, employers and supervising practitioners, the team determined that sixteen program standards are met in the Multiple Subject Programs. Three program standards are met minimally and two program standards are not met.

**Standard 1 - Program Design, Rationale and
Coordination****Not Met**

The program design was not clearly articulated in either the self study report or presentation to the team. The program described in the self study is not the program as it exists in practice. The current program has been organized to meet the needs of candidates employed by local school districts under emergency permit authorizations. Elements for an effective program are in place, however, the program lacks a conceptual framework which explains rationale for the delivery system. The absence of the clearly articulated design based upon a rationale inhibits the effective coordination of the program.

**Standard 2 - Development of Professional
Perspectives****Met Minimally with
Quantitative Concerns**

Faculty have dedicated considerable effort to ensure that each candidate develops an extensive professional knowledge base. Candidates, graduates and employers have determined that the content in professional preparation courses serves to develop professional perspective. Although candidates and graduates commented that they feel prepared to serve all students, a strand is missing that includes a clear and focused incorporation of English Language Development (ELD) and

Specially Designed Academic Instruction in English (SDAIE) instructional strategies.

Standard 6 - Preparation for Student Teaching Responsibilities

Met Minimally with Quantitative concerns

There is a concern about the extent of focus in the curriculum on ELD/SADIE methodologies and, for BCLAD candidates, primary language instructional strategies.

Standard 9 - Guidance, Assistance and Feedback

Met Minimally with Quantitative concerns

A comprehensive and cohesive feedback process is not evenly implemented. In some cases candidates received minimal feedback from school personnel and in other cases, university supervisors and master teachers did not coordinate their information about candidate progress. A process is not evident that ensures a uniform implementation of the feedback loop at each school site for each candidate.

Standard 21 - Determination of Candidate Competence

Not Met

Although there is a final assessment process that is used, based upon the California Standards for the Teaching Profession, the process does not formally include all of the elements of the standard and does not specifically address Program Standards 11-20. The team was unable to find evidence that candidates were evaluated according to those standards.

Strengths
All informants (superintendents, principals, and teachers) reported that the combined efforts of both NHU and school districts are producing teachers with preparation and skills that are comparable to candidates produced by other institutions in the area.

Employers have expressed that NHU graduates are prepared to serve all students.

The location of the campus in the neighborhood context makes it readily accessible and serves a local constituency. The institution's small and personal communication style facilitates that sense of access.

Concerns
None noted

Professional Comments

(These comments and observations from the team are only for the use of the institution. They are to be considered as consultative advice from team members, but are not binding on the institution. They are not considered as a part of the accreditation recommendation of the team.)

There are also instances of many collaborative and meaningful activities with the participating districts that indicate a high level of commitment to the institution's program.

The program responds to a need for innovative and alternative approaches to the credentialing of teachers who are on emergency permits. These candidates need programs that accelerate their preparation, require little travel, and are affordable.

This program has responded effectively to increased district demands for credentialed teachers.

Six superintendents, one California State University Dean of Education, and one school board member took time from their busy schedules to come to NHU to participate in the interview process. This tangible show of support and unanimous expression of goodwill relative to the importance of this institution in this location made a strong impression on the team.

There is no question that this institution is providing a major education service to this community.

The delivery of a module system for the curriculum is a major contribution to make education accessible to a working adult population.

The team recommends that the area of ELD/SDAIE, and primary language methodology be given more attention in this curriculum. Either the addition of a new course or increased focus in the current course sequence needs to be demonstrated.

With the recent expansion of the program and the fact that all students are already employed in classrooms on emergency permits, a review of the ratio of university based field supervisors to field placements appears to be in order.

[Back to the Top](#)

| [Back to July 1999 Agenda](#)



| [Return to "Agenda
Archives"](#) |

| [Return to "About CTC"](#) |





California Commission on Teacher Credentialing

Meeting of: July 7-8, 1999

Agenda Item Number: PREP-4

Committee: Preparation Standards

Title: Fourth Report and Additional Recommendations Regarding Implementation of AB 1620 (Scott)

✓ Action

Prepared by: Philip Fitch, Ed.D., Consultant
Professional Services Division

Summary of an Agenda Report

A Fourth Progress Report and Recommendations Regarding Implementation of AB 1620 (Scott Bill) Professional Services Division June 21, 1999

Executive Summary - Overview

This AB 1620 agenda item provides the Commissioners with a fourth report regarding activities and recommendations of the AB 1620 Task Force which last met on May 19-20 and June 10-11, 1999. At its last two meetings, the Task Force reviewed standards and guidelines for eleven (11) additional states, for a total of forty-two (42) states in the areas of preparation of special education teachers, elementary and secondary teachers, and for the accreditation and program approval procedure of institutions in each state. A set of **recommendations for action by the Commission is included in this agenda.**

AB 1620, sponsored by the Commission in the 1998-99 Legislative Year, was passed by the legislature without a single "no" vote and signed by then Governor Wilson as urgency legislation in August 1998. This agenda item refers to only two sections of the eight sections of AB 1620, specifically Sections 1 and 8. Plans for implementing Sections 2 through 7 were presented to the Commission at its November 1998 meeting.

Section 1 of AB 1620 (EC§44274) requires the Commission to conduct periodic reviews, beginning in 1998, to determine whether any state has established teacher preparation standards that are at least comparable and equivalent to teacher preparation standards in California, and to initiate negotiations with these states to provide reciprocity in teacher credentialing. If this determination is made, Section 1 of the bill requires the Commission to issue an equivalent teaching credential, permit or certificate to an applicant holding or qualifying for a teaching credential, permit or certificate awarded by a state that has entered into a reciprocity agreement with the Commission. Section 1 of AB 1620 requires the Commission to grant an appropriate credential to any applicant from another state who has completed teacher preparation equivalent to teacher preparation standards in California, whether a reciprocity agreement with other states is pending completion or the other state has declined to enter into a reciprocity agreement with California. The bill also requires the Commission to issue a five-year preliminary specialist instruction credential authorizing instruction of pupils with disabilities to an applicant who holds or qualifies for a valid special education credential from another state that has special education standards determined by the Commission to be equivalent and comparable to California's standards.

During September and October, members of the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing (CCTC) reciprocity management team met to determine ways to obtain standards and procedural documents from other states and to determine the extent to which other states' standards and procedures were both comparable and equivalent. In November, letters of request for information were sent to the other forty-nine states by the Executive Director. Also, letters were sent to select out-of-state universities that were identified by other state Departments of Education, Commissions or Professional Boards. To date material has been received from forty-two other states and from several out-of-state universities and colleges. A nineteen-member Reciprocity Task Force was formed in November 1998 to identify procedures for determining equivalency and comparability of other states' standards, guidelines and procedures for preparing elementary, secondary and special education teachers. The Task Force met six times for two days in January, February, March, April, May and June, 1999 to develop and implement procedures for determining comparability.

Policy Issues to be Resolved

The following policy questions are addressed in this agenda item:

- Are there other states that have equivalent and comparable standards and procedures for the preparation, credentialing and licensing of elementary, secondary and special education teachers?
- Are there other states that have program approval, accreditation or quality assurance procedures and policies that are comparable and equivalent to those of California?
- Are there other states that have developed and require basic skills tests and subject-matter requirements that are equivalent and comparable to those of California?
- Are there other states that wish to enter into a reciprocity agreement with California?

Relationship to the Commission's Strategic Goals and Objectives

Goals:

- Promote educational excellence in California schools.
- Take a leadership role in recruiting and preparing qualified teachers in response to class size reductions.
- Consider options including internships, waivers, emergency permits, apprenticeships, and certifications to meet the needs of California classrooms.

Fiscal Impact Statement

AB 1620 appropriated \$90,000 from the Teacher Credentials Fund for the 1998-99 fiscal year for expenditure by the Commission for the purpose of conducting a review to determine whether any state has established teacher preparation standards that meet or exceed California standards. Staff believes that these funds are sufficient to complete the initial reciprocity study but will not be sufficient to cover the on-going activities necessary to maintain reciprocity agreements with other states.

Recommendations

That the Commission approve the recommendations of the AB 1620 Reciprocity Task Force related to findings of comparability in accreditation and program standards for teacher preparation and preparation of special educators in selected states reviewed at the May 19-20 and June 10-11, 1999 Task Force meetings.

Important Note

The following agenda item contains important information that is relevant to the Commission's policy deliberations but could not be summarized in the above spaces.

Recommendations of the Task Force from the May and June 1999 Meetings

The Commission Staff and the AB 1620 Task Force recommend that the Commission approve the following decisions of the Task Force related to program accreditation procedures, elementary and secondary teacher preparation programs, and special education teacher preparation programs in states reviewed to date:

State Task Force Decision

1. North Carolina	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• The special education areas of Mild to Moderate, Moderate to Severe, Deaf and Hard of Hearing, Visual Impairments, and Early Childhood Special Ed were found to be equivalent and comparable for the Preliminary Level I credential.• The special education areas of Language, Speech and Hearing, and Audiology were found to be equivalent and comparable for the clear credential.• The special education area of Mild to Moderate (masters degree and license in specific learning disabilities and license in behavioral disorders) was found to be equivalent and comparable for the Level II credential.
2. Utah	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• The special education areas of Mild to Moderate, Moderate to Severe, Deaf and Hard of Hearing, Visual Impairments, and Early Childhood Special Ed were found to be equivalent and comparable for the Preliminary Level I credential.
3. Missouri	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Elementary and secondary standards were found to be equivalent and comparable.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The special education areas of Mild to Moderate, Moderate to Severe, Deaf and Hard of Hearing, Physical and Health Impairments, and Visual Impairments were found to be equivalent and comparable for the Preliminary Level I credential. • The special education areas of Language, Speech and Hearing were found to be equivalent and comparable for the clear credential.
4. Delaware	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Accreditation-program review procedures and eight common standards were found to be equivalent and comparable.
5. Montana	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The special education area of Mild to Moderate was found to be equivalent and comparable for the Preliminary Level I credential.
6. Arizona	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Elementary and secondary standards were found to be equivalent and comparable.
7. Georgia	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The special education areas of Mild to Moderate, Deaf and Hard of Hearing, Visual Impairments, and Physical and Health Impairments were found to be equivalent and comparable for the Preliminary Level I credential.
8. Oregon	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The special education areas of Mild to Moderate, Moderate to Severe, Visual Impairments, and Deaf and Hard of Hearing were found to be equivalent and comparable for the Preliminary Level I credential. • The special education areas of Language, Speech and Hearing were found to be equivalent and comparable for the clear credential.
9. Arkansas	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Accreditation-program review procedures and eight common standards were found to be equivalent and comparable.
10. Pennsylvania	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Accreditation-program review procedures and eight common standards were found to be equivalent and comparable. • The special education areas of Mild to Moderate, Moderate to Severe, Deaf and Hard of Hearing, and Visual Impairments were found to be equivalent and comparable for the Preliminary Level I credential. • The special education areas of Language, Speech and Hearing (with masters degree) were found to be equivalent and comparable for the clear credential.
11. Louisiana	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The special education areas of Mild to Moderate, Moderate to Severe, Deaf and Hard of Hearing, Visual Impairments, and Early Childhood Special Ed were found to be equivalent and comparable for the Preliminary Level I credential.
12. Idaho	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Accreditation-program review procedures and eight common standards were found to be equivalent and comparable.
13. Virginia	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Accreditation-program review procedures and eight common standards were found to be equivalent and comparable.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Accreditation-program review procedures and

	eight common standards were found to be equivalent and comparable.
15. North Dakota	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Accreditation-program review procedures and eight common standards were found to be equivalent and comparable.
16. South Carolina	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Accreditation-program review procedures and eight common standards were found to be equivalent and comparable.
17. Oklahoma	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Accreditation-program review procedures and eight common standards were found to be equivalent and comparable.
As the Task Force continues to meet, staff and representatives of the Task Force will bring updates and further recommendations to the Commission for its consideration and action.	

Previous Action of the Commission

At its March 3-4, April 14-15, and May 5-6, 1999 meetings the Commission approved the following states as having comparable standards and accreditation procedures on the recommendation of the AB 1620 Task Force.

State Task Force Decision

1. Maryland	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Accreditation-program review procedures and eight common standards were found to be equivalent and comparable. • Elementary and secondary standards were found to be equivalent and comparable.
2. Kentucky	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Accreditation-program review procedures and eight common standards were found to be equivalent and comparable.
3. Kansas	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Accreditation-program review procedures and eight common standards were found to be equivalent and comparable. • The special education areas of Language, Speech, and Hearing, and Audiology were found to be equivalent and comparable.
4. Colorado	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Accreditation-program review procedures and eight common standards were found to be equivalent and comparable. • Elementary and secondary standards were found to be equivalent and comparable. • The special education areas of Mild to Moderate (with endorsements in moderate and affective disabilities), Moderate to Severe (with endorsements in moderate and affective or severe and affective), Deaf and Hard of Hearing, Physical and Health Impairments, Visual Impairments, Early Childhood Special Ed, and Orientation and Mobility were found to be comparable and equivalent for the Preliminary Level I credential. • The special education areas of Language, Speech and Hearing, Audiology, and Special Class Authorization were found to be equivalent and comparable for the clear credential.
5. Alabama	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Accreditation-program review procedures and eight common standards were found to be equivalent and comparable. • The special education areas of Mild to Moderate, Moderate to Severe, Deaf and Hard of Hearing,

	<p>Physical and Health Impairments, Visual Impairments, and Early Childhood Special Ed were found to be equivalent and comparable for the Preliminary Level I credential.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The special education areas of Language, Speech and Hearing with proof of Masters Degree were found to be comparable and equivalent for the clear credential.
6. Nebraska	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Accreditation-program review procedures and eight common standards were found to be equivalent and comparable. • Elementary and secondary standards were found to be equivalent and comparable. • The special education areas of Mild to Moderate, Moderate to Severe, Deaf and Hard of Hearing (pre K-12) or (K-9) or (pre K-3 and 7-12), Visual Impairments, Early Childhood Special Ed, and Speech Language Pathology (not Speech Language Technician) were found to be equivalent and comparable for the Preliminary Level 1 credential.
7. Tennessee	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Accreditation-program review procedures and eight common standards were found to be equivalent and comparable. • Elementary and secondary standards were found to be equivalent and comparable. • The special education areas of Mild to Moderate, Moderate to Severe, Deaf and Hard of Hearing, Physical and Health Impairments, Visual Impairments, and Early Childhood Special Ed were found to be equivalent and comparable for the Preliminary Level I credential. • The special education areas of Language, Speech and Hearing were found to be equivalent and comparable for the clear credential.
8. Rhode Island	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Accreditation-program review procedures and eight common standards were found to be equivalent and comparable. • Elementary and secondary standards were found to be equivalent and comparable. • The special education areas of Mild to Moderate, Moderate to Severe, Deaf and Hard of Hearing, Visually Impaired, and Early Childhood Ed (comparable with Early Childhood and Special Ed authorization) were found to be equivalent and comparable for the Preliminary Level 1 credential. • The special education areas of Language, Speech and Hearing, and Audiology were found to be equivalent and comparable for the clear credential.
9. North Carolina	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Accreditation-program review procedures and eight common standards were found to be equivalent and comparable. • Elementary and secondary standards were found to be equivalent and comparable.
10. Washington	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Accreditation-program review procedures and eight common standards were found to be equivalent and comparable. • Elementary and secondary standards were found to be equivalent and comparable. • The special education areas of audiology and speech pathology were found to be comparable.
11. Utah	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Accreditation-program review procedures and eight common standards were found to be equivalent and comparable.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Elementary and secondary standards were found to be equivalent and comparable.
12. Missouri	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Accreditation-program review procedures and eight common standards were found to be equivalent and comparable.
13. Montana	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Accreditation-program review procedures and eight common standards were found to be equivalent and comparable.
14. Illinois	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Accreditation-program review procedures and eight common standards were found to be equivalent and comparable.
15. Arizona	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Accreditation-program review procedures and eight common standards were found to be equivalent and comparable.
16. Georgia	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Accreditation-program review procedures and eight common standards were found to be equivalent and comparable. Elementary and secondary standards were found to be equivalent and comparable.
17. Oregon	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Accreditation-program review procedures and eight common standards were found to be equivalent and comparable.
18. Wyoming	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Accreditation-program review procedures and eight common standards were found to be equivalent and comparable.
19. Maine	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Accreditation-program review procedures and eight common standards were found to be equivalent and comparable. Elementary and secondary standards were found to be equivalent and comparable.
20. Louisiana	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Accreditation-program review procedures and eight common standards were found to be equivalent and comparable.
21. New Mexico	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Accreditation-program review procedures and eight common standards were found to be equivalent and comparable.
22. Indiana	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Accreditation-program review procedures and eight common standards were found to be equivalent and comparable.
23. Wisconsin	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Accreditation-program review procedures and eight common standards were found to be equivalent and comparable.

Background

For more than two decades the Commission has considered the issue of credential reciprocity. To this end it has participated in a variety of activities to interact with other states to develop agreements that might allow the Commission to accept candidates prepared by accredited out-of-state institutions approved by their state's department of education, commission or board. However, specific requirements in various states have created difficulties for teachers prepared in one state who seek certification in another state. Interstate agreements in past years have been limited in scope, and have ensured little, if any, credential reciprocity between the participating states. For instance, the Commission has signed with 39 other states as a

member of the NASDTEC Interstate Compact. For many states this compact is primarily an agreement to work together and does not provide for specific reciprocal agreements for teacher credentialing and licensure. In fact, credential reciprocity has not been reachable in California under any prior or current interstate agreement.

In sponsoring AB 1620, the Commission has taken a major step in establishing reciprocity with other states. This legislation permits the Commission to enter into reciprocal agreements with those states that are determined to have comparable and equivalent teacher preparation standards to those required for teachers prepared in California. The law provides:

(a) The commission shall conduct periodic reviews, beginning in 1998, to determine whether any state has established teacher preparation standards that are at least comparable and equivalent to teacher preparation standards in California.

(b) When the commission determines, pursuant to subdivision (a), that the teacher preparation standards established by any state are at least comparable and equivalent to teacher preparation standards in California, the commission shall initiate negotiations with that state to provide reciprocity in teacher credentialing.

California Education Code, Section 44274

AB 1620 established Sections 44274, 44274.2, 44274.4, and 44274.5, introducing several provisions related to the California certification of teachers prepared in other states. At its November 1998 meeting, staff presented a plan for implementing elements of the law that apply to teachers with three to five years of teaching experience. The Commissioners approved this plan, staff has implemented the plan, and the Commission is now able to grant credentials to those teachers able to verify they meet the requirements established for experienced teachers in these sections.

Section 44274 relates to the pursuit of credential reciprocity agreements with those states determined by the Commission to have comparable teacher preparation standards to those in California. Specifically, EC§44274(a) and (b) require the Commission to conduct periodic reviews of other states' teacher preparation standards. Subsection (c) requires the Commission to grant to a teacher prepared in another state with comparable standards an equivalent California credential. The California credential is to be issued regardless of whether a credential reciprocity agreement is established or pending, or the other state declines to enter into a credential reciprocity agreement with California.

In November 1998, letters were sent to the other 49 states from the Executive Director to inform them of the Scott legislation and to request their assistance in the reciprocity study. More recently the staff has also requested materials for the District of Columbia. The following materials were requested:

- materials relating to the specific certification requirements for teaching in early childhood education, elementary education, middle school or junior high school education, high school and special education;
- materials relating to their state's requirements for verifying knowledge of the subject curricula to be taught at elementary and secondary levels;
- materials relating to the state standards or guidelines that are required by their state for universities and colleges to develop professional preparation programs for elementary, secondary and special education teachers; and
- materials that are used by their state agency for conducting program reviews on accreditation visits, such as materials relating to procedures for site visits, team member composition, and frequency of visits.

To date, forty-two states have responded to this request and the Reciprocity Task Force has been able to review and analyze these materials at the January, February, March, April, May, and June meetings of the Task Force. In a number of cases, Commission staff has needed to follow up with specific requests for other material or to obtain clarification on the material that was under review by the Task Force.

AB 1620 - Reciprocity Task Force

In November, a nineteen-member Reciprocity Task Force was created to develop processes for determining the equivalency and comparability of other state's standards and program review or accreditation procedures. Task Force members were identified by Commission consultants who have responsibility for the special education panel, accreditation teams, and standard-setting panels. Individuals were identified who have extensive professional experience and expertise in the standards areas being analyzed and reviewed. The Commission's procedures, as stated in the Policy Manual, were followed to ensure gender, ethnic, racial and geographic balance in K-12 schools and in higher education. Most importantly, the individuals involved needed to have a professional reputation for being able to make holistic, qualitative professional judgments regarding the comparability of standards.

The task force identified herein was charged with conducting the review of other states' teacher preparation standards, and recommending states for recognition as having comparable standards based upon this review.

Further, given that Section 44274(c) calls for granting an equivalent California credential to the credential earned in the other state, the Task Force will recommend the appropriate level of credential (preliminary or professional clear) to be granted to an individual from an approved state based upon the level of preparation they are required to complete by that state's standards.

The Task Force has been divided into three working groups or teams:

- Accreditation and Common Standards Team
- Elementary and Secondary Standards Team
- Special Education Standards Team

The membership of the three teams is listed below.

Accreditation and Common Standards Team

Dr. Phyllis Fernlund, Dean, School of Education, Sonoma State University

Dr. Irving Hendrick, Former Dean, School of Education, UC Riverside

Dr. Jim Scott, Superintendent of Schools, Eureka Public Schools

Ms. Judy Silver, Principal, Barnard-White Middle School, Union City

Dr. Alice Watkins, Dean, School of Education, Azusa Pacific University

Dr. Lamar Mayer, Past Associate Dean, School of Education, CSU Los Angeles

Elementary and Secondary Standards Team

Dr. Linda Childress, BTSA Director, Inland Empire, Riverside County Office of Education

Dr. Jacob Perea, Dean, College of Education, San Francisco State University

Mr. Hank Richardson, Assistant Superintendent Personnel, Hesperia Unified School District

Dr. Joan Rossi, Department of Education, College of Notre Dame

Ms. Linda Strom, Director, Certified Personnel, Elk Grove Unified School District

Ms. Kathy Walker, Director of Curriculum and Instruction, Bakersfield City Schools

Special Education Standards Team

Dr. Tory Courtney, School of Education, Saint Mary's College

Ms. Sue Craig, Resource Specialist, Mild/Moderate, Red Bluff Union High School

Dr. Robert Jordan, Director, Special Education, San Diego County Office of Education

Dr. Noma LeMoine, Director, Specialized Programs, Los Angeles Unified School District

Dr. Terry Saenz, Department of Speech Communication, CSU Fullerton

Dr. Karl Skindrud, School of Education, Department of Special Education, California State University, Dominguez Hills

Dr. Jean van Keulen, Chair, Department of Special Education, San Francisco State University

Examples of the various matrices used by the teams are presented in Appendix A of this agenda item. Team members are prepared to discuss the procedures used to analyze each set of state standards, standard by standard, to determine qualitatively and holistically that other states' standards are equivalent and comparable.

Following are some of the operational procedures that were agreed to by the members of the Task Force.

Task Force Norms/Agreed Upon Procedures

Norms:

- Task Force will make recommendations either for preliminary or professional clear credentials based on each state's standards.
- Task Force will recommend or deny elementary or secondary or special education comparability independently.
- Special Education Authorizations will be recommended individually specifically by credential area.
- Task Force will review state documents first to determine comparability, then use institutional documents if necessary.
- Task Force members will identify other information needed for making comparability decisions.
- Task Force teams will provide CCTC Staff with a final statement of decisions they reach.
- The Accreditation Team will review state documents for the eight Common Standards as well as accreditation process comparability and report their findings to other teams.
- The decisions of the Accreditation and Common Standards Team are prerequisites to determining comparability in special education, elementary and secondary teaching.
- The Accreditation and Common Standards Team will determine which states the other teams will review.

As stated earlier in this item, the Reciprocity Task Force has met for two days in January, February, March, April, May, and June, 1999. The Task Force will continue to meet in the Fall at the Country Suites in Ontario. The management team will inform the Commission of the Fall meeting dates when a schedule is available. Anyone interested in observing the work of the Task Force is welcome to attend all or any part of the two-day meetings.

To date, forty-two (42) sets of other state standards have been reviewed by members of the Task Force. Following is a chart that provides the Commission with the status of each state review.

State Review Status

Accreditation/Common Standards Team	
42 States Reviewed	32-Comparable
	3-Not Comparable
	1-Decision Pending Approval of Draft Revised Standards
	2-Decision Pending Additional Information
	3-Need More Information
	1-Needs Further Review
Elementary and Secondary Standards Team	
31 States Reviewed	12-Comparable
	3-Accreditation Not Comparable
	15-Need More Information
	1-Needs Further Review
11 States Yet to be Reviewed	
Special Education Standards Team	
33 States Reviewed	15-Comparable in Select Areas
	1-Not Comparable
	3-Accreditation Not Comparable
	13-Need More Information
	1-Needs Further Review
9 States Yet to be Reviewed	

Appendix A Final Review Forms

AB 1620 - Reciprocity Study

Task Force Decisions as of May 19-20 and June 10-11, 1999

State	Standards for Elementary & Secondary Teacher Preparation	Comparable or not Comparable	Standards for Special Education	Comparable or not Comparable	Standards for Program Review or Accreditation	Comparable or not Comparable
1. Maryland	UM - Elementary and Secondary Program NCATE Standards INTASC Standards Professional Development School	Elementary Standards Comparable Secondary Standards Comparable	National Council for Exceptional Children Standards	Need more information	Program Approval Manual NCATE - Initial and Continuing Professional Development School	Accreditation Procedures and Standards Comparable
2. Kentucky	NCATE INTASC	Need more information	Need Special Ed Standards Council for Exceptional Children	Need more information	NCATE INTASC Education Professional	Accreditation Procedures and Standards Comparable

	<p>State Standards</p> <p>Northern Kentucky University: Folio - Elementary Education Grades P-5</p> <p>Appendix A - Conceptual Framework Course Syllabus</p> <p>New Teacher Standards</p>		New Teacher Standards		Standards Board	
3. Kansas	<p>NCATE Standards</p> <p>State Standards for Elementary and Secondary Teachers</p> <p>Kansas State University -- NCATE institutional report and program materials</p> <p>University of Kansas Program Materials</p>	Need more information	Special Education Standards	Comparable in the following credential areas: Language, Speech, and Hearing, and Audiology	<p>Accredited Institutions</p> <p>NCATE Standards</p> <p>Instructional Handbook for Program Approval</p> <p>Accreditation</p>	Accreditation Procedures and Standards Comparable
4. Colorado	<p>Knowledge of Content and Learning</p> <p>INTASC Standards</p>	<p>Elementary Standards Comparable</p> <p>Secondary Standards Comparable</p>	Special Education Endorsements	<p>Comparable in the following areas for the Preliminary Level I credential: Mild to Moderate (with endorsements in moderate and affective disabilities), Moderate to Severe (with endorsements in moderate and affective or severe and affective), Deaf and Hard of Hearing, Physical and Health Impairments, Visual Impairments, Early Childhood Special Ed, and Orientation and Mobility</p> <p>Comparable in the following areas for the clear credential:</p> <p>Language, Speech and Hearing, Audiology, and Special Class Authorization</p>	<p>Professional Education Approval</p> <p>NCATE Standards</p> <p>INTASC Standards</p>	Accreditation Procedures and Standards Comparable
5. Alabama	<p>Teacher Education Standards</p> <p>INTASC Standards</p> <p>NCATE Standards</p>	Need more information	Special Education	Comparable in the following areas for the Preliminary Level I credential: Mild to Moderate,	NCATE and State Standards	Accreditation Procedures and Standards Comparable

	Draft Teacher Education Program Standards			<p>Moderate to Severe, Deaf and Hard of Hearing, Physical and Health Impairments, Visual Impairments, and Early Childhood Special Ed</p> <p>Comparable in the following areas for the clear credential: Language, Speech and Hearing with proof of Masters Degree</p>		
6. Nebraska	<p>Elementary Standards</p> <p>Secondary Standards</p> <p>NCATE Standards</p>	<p>Elementary Standards Comparable</p> <p>Secondary Standards Comparable</p>	Special Education Standards	<p>Comparable in the following areas for the Preliminary Level I credential: Mild to Moderate, Moderate to Severe, Deaf and Hard of Hearing (pre K-12) or (K-9) or (pre K-3 and 7-12), Visual Impairments, Early Childhood Special Ed, and Speech Language Pathology (not Speech Language Technician).</p>	<p>NCATE Standards</p> <p>University of Nebraska</p> <p>Approved Colleges</p> <p>Council On Teacher Education Policies</p>	Accreditation Procedures and Standards Comparable
7. Tennessee	<p>General Education Elementary Professional Education</p> <p>General Education Secondary Professional Education</p> <p>Program Approval Standards</p> <p>NCATE Standards</p>	<p>Elementary Standards Comparable</p> <p>Secondary Standards Comparable</p>	<p>General Education</p> <p>Professional Education</p> <p>Elementary</p> <p>Secondary</p> <p>Special Education Standards</p>	<p>Comparable in the following areas for the Preliminary Level I credential: Mild to Moderate, Moderate to Severe, Deaf and Hard of Hearing, Physical and Health Impairments, Visual Impairments, and Early Childhood Special Ed</p> <p>Comparable in the following areas for the clear credential: Language, Speech and Hearing</p>	<p>Professional Education</p> <p>Program Approval Standards</p> <p>NCATE Standards</p>	Accreditation Procedures and Standards Comparable
8. Rhode Island	<p>Requirements for Early Childhood, Elementary</p> <p>Middle School,</p>	<p>Elementary Standards Comparable</p> <p>Secondary Standards Comparable</p>	<p>Requirements for Early Childhood Special Ed.</p> <p>Elementary and</p>	<p>Comparable in the following areas for the Preliminary Level I</p>	<p>Program Approval Standards</p> <p>Commissioner's Standards for the</p>	Accreditation Procedures and Standards Comparable

	<p>Secondary</p> <p>Beginning Teacher Standards</p> <p>Commissioner's Standards</p> <p>NCATE Standards</p>		<p>Middle School Special Ed.</p> <p>Secondary Special Ed., Severe and Profound</p> <p>Commissioner's Standards</p>	<p>credential: Mild to Moderate, Moderate to Severe, Deaf and Hard of Hearing, Visually Impaired, and Early Childhood Ed (comparable with Early Childhood and Special Ed authorization)</p> <p>Comparable in the following areas for the clear credential: Language, Speech and Hearing, and Audiology</p>	<p>Approval of Teacher Education Programs</p> <p>NCATE Standards</p>	
9. North Carolina	<p>Teacher Education Program</p> <p>Professional Studies</p> <p>Licensure for Public Schools</p> <p>NCATE Standards</p> <p>Program Directory</p>	<p>Elementary Standards Comparable</p> <p>Secondary Standards Comparable</p>	<p>Teacher Education Program</p> <p>Special Education Standards</p> <p>Licensure for Public Schools</p> <p>NCATE Standards</p> <p>Program Directory</p>	<p>Comparable in the following areas for the Preliminary Level I credential: Mild to Moderate, Moderate to Severe, Deaf and Hard of Hearing, Visual Impairments, and Early Childhood Special Ed</p> <p>Comparable in the following areas for the clear credential: Language, Speech and Hearing, and Audiology</p> <p>Comparable in the following area for the Level II credential: Mild to Moderate (masters degree and license in specific learning disabilities and license in behavioral disorders).</p>	<p>Teacher Education Program</p> <p>Professional Studies</p> <p>Standards for the Approval of Teacher Education Institute</p> <p>NCATE Standards</p> <p>Program Directory</p>	<p>Accreditation Procedures and Standards Comparable</p>
10. Washington	<p>Approval Standards for Performance Board</p> <p>NCATE Standards</p> <p>INTASC Standards</p> <p>Approved Program and Certification Guidelines</p> <p>Endorsements for Teacher</p>	<p>Elementary Standards Comparable</p> <p>Secondary Standards Comparable</p>	<p>Approval Standards for Performance Board</p> <p>NCATE Standards</p> <p>Approved Program and Certification Guidelines</p> <p>Endorsements for Teacher Certificates</p>	<p>Comparable in the following credential areas: Language, Speech and Hearing, and Audiology</p>	<p>Approval Standards for Performance Board</p> <p>NCATE Standards</p> <p>Approved Program and Certification Guidelines</p> <p>Endorsements for Teacher Certificates</p> <p>Guidelines for Approval of Professional</p>	<p>Accreditation Procedures and Standards Comparable</p>

	<p>Certificates</p> <p>Guidelines for Approval of Professional Education Programs</p> <p>Approved Program Directory</p>		<p>Guidelines for Approval of Professional Education Programs</p> <p>Approved Program Directory</p>		<p>Education Programs</p> <p>Approved Program Directory</p>	
11. New Jersey	<p>Standards for Teacher Education Programs</p> <p>Indicators of Compliance and Quality</p> <p>NASDTEC Standards</p>	<p>Accreditation Procedures and Standards Not Comparable</p>	<p>Standards for Teacher Education Programs</p> <p>Indicators of Compliance and Quality</p> <p>NASDTEC Standards</p> <p>Need Special Ed Standards</p>	<p>Accreditation Procedures and Standards Not Comparable</p>	<p>Standards for Teacher Education Programs</p> <p>Indicators of Compliance and Quality</p> <p>NASDTEC Standards</p>	<p>Accreditation Procedures and Standards Not Comparable</p>
12. Utah	<p>Teacher Education Programs</p> <p>Certification Requirements</p> <p>Certification Standards</p> <p>Utah State Core Reading - Grades 4-6</p> <p>NCATE Standards</p> <p>NASDTEC Standards</p> <p>Multicultural Education Standards - State Standards and State University Response</p>	<p>Elementary Standards Comparable</p> <p>Secondary Standards Comparable</p>	<p>Certification Requirements</p> <p>Certification Standards</p>	<p>Comparable in the following areas for the Preliminary Level I credential: Mild to Moderate, Moderate to Severe, Deaf and Hard of Hearing, Visual Impairments, and Early Childhood Special Ed</p>	<p>Teacher Education Programs</p> <p>Certification Requirements</p> <p>Certification Standards</p> <p>NCATE Standards</p> <p>NASDTEC Standards</p>	<p>Accreditation Procedures and Standards Comparable</p>
13. Missouri	<p>Standards for Teacher Education Programs</p> <p>Design of Professional Education</p> <p>Standards for School Leaders</p> <p>Standards for Teacher Education Procedures for Program Review</p> <p>Professional Education Programs Annual Report Form</p> <p>Directory of Approved Professional Education Programs</p> <p>Certification Requirements</p>	<p>Elementary Standards Comparable</p> <p>Secondary Standards Comparable</p>	<p>Standards for Teacher Education Programs</p> <p>Design of Professional Education</p> <p>Standards for School Leaders</p> <p>Standards for Teacher Education Procedures for Program Review</p> <p>Professional Education Programs Annual Report Form</p> <p>Special Education Certification Requirements</p> <p>Special Education Subject Competencies</p>	<p>Comparable in the following areas for the Preliminary Level I credential: Mild to Moderate, Moderate to Severe, Deaf and Hard of Hearing, Physical and Health Impairments, and Visual Impairments</p> <p>Comparable in the following areas for the clear credential: Language, Speech and Hearing</p>	<p>Standards for Teacher Education Programs</p> <p>Design of Professional Education</p> <p>Standards for School Leaders</p> <p>Standards for Teacher Education Procedures for Program Review</p> <p>Professional Education Programs Annual Report Form</p> <p>Directory of Approved Professional Education Programs</p>	<p>Accreditation Procedures and Standards Comparable</p>
14. Delaware	<p>Professional Teaching Standards</p> <p>Regulations for</p>	<p>Need more information</p>	<p>Professional Teaching Standards</p> <p>Certification</p>	<p>Need more information</p>	<p>Professional Teaching Standards</p> <p>Regulations for the Approval of Teacher</p>	<p>Accreditation Procedures and Standards Comparable</p>

	the Approval of Teacher Education Programs NASDTEC/NCATE Standards Certification Requirements		Requirements		Education Programs NASDTEC/NCATE Standards	
15. Montana	Teacher Education Program Standards Procedures Manual for Montana Teacher Education Standards	Yet to be reviewed	Teacher Education Program Standards Procedures Manual for Montana Teacher Education Standards	Comparable in the following area for the Preliminary Level I credential: Mild to Moderate	Teacher Education Program Standards Procedures Manual for Montana Teacher Education Standards	Accreditation Procedures and Standards Comparable
16. Illinois	Minimum Requirements for State Certificates Preparing Educators for the 21 st Century - Draft Recommendations Directory of Approved Teacher Preparation Programs NCATE Standards	Need more information	Minimum Requirements for State Certificates Preparing Educators for the 21 st Century - Draft Recommendations Directory of Approved Teacher Preparation Programs Special Education Certification and Approval Requirements and Procedures	Special Education Standards Not Comparable	Minimum Requirements for State Certificates Preparing Educators for the 21 st Century - Draft Recommendations Directory of Approved Teacher Preparation Programs Draft Regulations for Approval of Teacher Preparation Programs NCATE Standards	Accreditation Procedures and Standards Comparable
17. Arizona	Professional Development Title 7. Education Northern Arizona University - Self-Study Report	Elementary Standards Comparable Secondary Standards Comparable	Professional Development Title 7. Education (pg. 12-17)	Need more information	Professional Development Title 7. Education Professional Preparation Programs (pg. 7-8)	Accreditation Procedures and Standards Comparable
18. Minnesota	Proposed Rules Governing Teacher Licensing	Accreditation Procedures and Standards Not Comparable	Proposed Rules Governing Teacher Licensing	Accreditation Procedures and Standards Not Comparable	Proposed Rules Governing Teacher Licensing Program Approval Rules	Accreditation Procedures and Standards Not Comparable
19. Georgia	Standards for Professional Education Units and Programs Handbook for Board of Examiners Teams NCATE Standards	Elementary Standards Comparable Secondary Standards Comparable	Standards for Professional Education Units and Programs Handbook for Board of Examiners Teams Speech and Language Pathology and Audiology Standards	Comparable in the following areas for the Preliminary Level I credential: Mild to Moderate, Deaf and Hard of Hearing, Visual Impairments, and Physical and Health Impairments	Standards for Professional Education Units and Programs Handbook for Board of Examiners Teams NCATE Standards	Accreditation Procedures and Standards Comparable
20. Oregon	Administrative Rules for On-Site Visits Approved Teacher Education Programs Continuing Professional Development for Licensure Renewal	Need more information	Administrative Rules for On-Site Visits Approved Teacher Education Programs Continuing Professional Development for Licensure	Comparable in the following areas for the Preliminary Level I credential: Mild to Moderate, Moderate to Severe, Visual Impairments, and Deaf and	Administrative Rules for On-Site Visits Approved Teacher Education Programs Continuing Professional Development for Licensure Renewal Teacher Licensure for	Accreditation Procedures and Standards Comparable

	<p>Teacher Licensure for 21st Century Schools</p> <p>Preparing Quality Educators for 21st Century Schools</p> <p>Letter - Eastern Oregon University</p> <p>Standards for Program Approval</p> <p>Standards for Teacher Preparation Programs</p> <p>Eastern Oregon University -- Teacher Education Document</p> <p>George Fox University -- Teacher Education Document</p>		<p>Teacher Licensure for 21st Century Schools</p> <p>Preparing Quality Educators for 21st Century Schools</p> <p>Special Education Standards</p>	<p>Hearing</p> <p>Comparable in the following areas for the clear credential: Language, Speech and Hearing</p>	<p>21 Century Schools</p> <p>Preparing Quality Educators for 21st Century Schools</p> <p>Program Approval Site Visit Handbook</p>	
21. Wyoming	<p>Professional Teaching Standards Board - General Provisions</p> <p>Bilingual Education (pg. 49-50)</p> <p>Program Standards (pg. 7-38)</p> <p>NCATE Standards</p> <p>University of Wyoming: Course Outlines</p>	Need more information	<p>Professional Teaching Standards Board - General Provisions</p> <p>Program Standards (pg. 38-44 and pg. 70-71)</p> <p>NCATE Standards</p>	Need more information	<p>Professional Teaching Standards Board - General Provisions</p> <p>Program Standards (pg. 71-73)</p> <p>NCATE Standards</p> <p>Handbook for Professional Teaching Standards Board</p>	Accreditation Procedures and Standards Comparable
22. Arkansas	<p>NCATE Standards</p> <p>INTASC Standards</p>	Yet to be reviewed	Special Education Guidelines	Need more information	<p>NCATE only</p> <p>INTASC Standards</p>	Accreditation Procedures and Standards Comparable
23. Pennsylvania	<p>Standards and Policies (pg. 1-12)</p> <p>Instructional Certificates (pg. 12-108)</p>	Need more information	Special Education Standards and Policies (pg. 61-70)	<p>Comparable in the following areas for the Preliminary Level I credential: Mild to Moderate, Moderate to Severe, Deaf and Hard of Hearing, and Visual Impairments</p> <p>Comparable in the following areas for the clear credential: Language, Speech and Hearing with masters degree.</p>	<p>Administrative Procedures for Program Approval</p> <p>Partnership State</p> <p>General Standards (pg. 1-12)</p>	Accreditation Procedures and Standards Comparable
24. Maine	<p>Policies, Procedures and Standard</p> <p>Eight Program Approval Standards</p>	<p>Elementary Standards Comparable</p> <p>Secondary Standards Comparable</p>	Special Education Competencies (Sections 9030, 8079, 2282, 6282, 8293)	Need further review	<p>Policies, Procedures and Standards</p> <p>Eight Program Approval Standards (Chapter 114)</p>	Accreditation Procedures and Standards Comparable

	(Chapter 114) NCATE Standards (see Chart 1) Section 2020 INTASC Standards				NCATE Partnership (see Chart 1) INTASC Standards	
25. Louisiana	Bulletin 996 - Standards for Program Approval Bulletin 746 -- Policies and Procedures for Louisiana Teacher Assessment	Need more information	Bulletin 746 -- Policies and Procedures for Louisiana Teacher Assessment Part VII - Teachers of Exceptional Children	Comparable in the following areas for the Preliminary Level I credential: Mild to Moderate, Moderate to Severe, Deaf and Hard of Hearing, Visual Impairments, and Early Childhood Special Ed	Bulletin 996 - Standards for Program Approval NCATE Standards and Procedures	Accreditation Procedures and Standards Comparable
26. New Mexico	Program Approval NCATE Partnership Title 6 - Primary and Secondary Licensure Requirements	Need further review	Title 6 - Licensure in Special Education K-12 Licensure Requirements: Special Education pg. 1-4	Need more information	NCATE Partnership State Program Approval Licensure Requirements	Accreditation Procedures and Standards Comparable
27. Indiana	Indiana Professional Standards Board Document: Programs for Teacher Education, Initial and Advanced NCATE Standards and Procedures INTASC Standards	Need more information	Indiana Professional Standards Board Document Teachers of Students with Exceptional Needs	Need more information	Indiana Professional Standards Board Document: Programs for Teacher Education, Initial and Advanced NCATE Standards and Procedures NTASC Standards	Accreditation Procedures and Standards Comparable
28. South Dakota	New Teacher Certification Rules Year 2000 Implementation Professional Education Requirements for Teaching Programs Requirements for Basic Teaching Programs	Yet to be reviewed	New Teacher Certification Rules Year 2000 Implementation Professional Education Requirements for Teaching Programs Requirements for Basic Teaching Programs Section 24:16 K- 12 Special Education Program K-12 American Sign Language Education	Yet to be reviewed	New Teacher Certification Rules Year 2000 Implementation Professional Education Requirements for Teaching Programs Requirements for Basic Teaching Programs Article 24:16:01 - 05 Teacher Education Program Approval NCATE Standards	Decision pending receipt of additional information
29. Idaho	Certification Manual NCATE Standards NASDTEC Standards	Need more information	Certification Manual NCATE Standards NASDTEC Standards	Need more information	Certification Manual NCATE Standards and Procedures ASDTEC Standards and Procedures	Accreditation Procedures and Standards Comparable

					Letter from state	
30. Florida	<p>Competencies and Skills Required for Teacher Certification in Florida (select sections)</p> <p>Standards for Initial Teacher Education Program Approval in Florida</p> <p>Performance Standards for Continuing Program Approval</p> <p>Accomplished, Professional, and Preprofessional Competencies for Teachers of the 21st Century</p> <p>Teacher Education Program Directory</p>	Yet to be reviewed	<p>Competencies and Skills Required for Teacher Certification in Florida (select sections, including special ed)</p> <p>Standards for Initial Teacher Education Program Approval in Florida</p> <p>Performance Standards for Continuing Program Approval</p> <p>Accomplished, Professional, and Preprofessional Competencies for Teachers of the 21st Century</p> <p>Teacher Education Program Directory</p>	Yet to be reviewed	<p>Competencies and Skills Required for Teacher Certification in Florida (select sections)</p> <p>Standards for Initial Teacher Education Program Approval in Florida</p> <p>Performance Standards for Continuing Program Approval</p> <p>Accomplished, Professional, and Preprofessional Competencies for Teachers of the 21st Century</p> <p>State Statutes and Board of Education Rules Governing Program Approval</p> <p>Teacher Education Program Directory</p> <p>Excerpts from the Florida Teacher Education Program Review Guidebook</p>	Decision pending receipt of additional information
31. Wisconsin	<p>Teacher Education Program Approval - Certification Rules</p> <p>Licensing Rules</p> <p>Proposed Order of the State Superintendent of Public Instruction Repealing and Recreating Rules (due to be promulgated July 1, 2000)</p>	Yet to be reviewed	<p>Teacher Education Program Approval - Certification Rules (Subchapter VII)</p> <p>Licensing Rules</p> <p>Proposed Order of the State Superintendent of Public Instruction Repealing and Recreating Rules (due to be promulgated July 1, 2000)</p>	Yet to be reviewed	<p>Teacher Education Program Approval - Certification Rules</p> <p>Licensing Rules</p> <p>Proposed Order of the State Superintendent of Public Instruction Repealing and Recreating Rules (due to be promulgated July 1, 2000)</p>	Accreditation Procedures and Standards Comparable
32. New Hampshire	<p>Standards and Procedures for Approving Professional Programs in New Hampshire</p> <p>Standards for Graduate Programs</p>	Yet to be reviewed	Exceptional Children Program Standards	Yet to be reviewed	<p>Standards and Procedures for Approving Professional Programs in New Hampshire</p> <p>Standards for Graduate Programs</p> <p>Approval of Professional Preparation Programs</p>	Need further review
33. Virginia	<p>Program Directory</p> <p>Approved Preparation Programs for Instructional Personnel</p>	Need more information	<p>Program Directory</p> <p>Approved Preparation Programs for Instructional Personnel: Special Education pg. 59</p>	Need more information	<p>Program Directory</p> <p>Approved Preparation Programs for Instructional Personnel</p>	Accreditation Procedures and Standards Comparable
34. Massachusetts	Regulations for the Certification of Educational Personnel in Massachusetts (pg. 16-19)	Yet to be reviewed	Regulations for the Certification of Educational Personnel in Massachusetts (pg. 48-54)	Yet to be reviewed	<p>Regulations for the Certification of Educational Personnel in Massachusetts (pg. 16-19)</p> <p>Directory of Educator</p>	Need more information

	Directory of Educator Preparation Programs		Directory of Educator Preparation Programs		Preparation Programs	
35. Hawaii	<p>Hawaii Teacher Standards Board</p> <p>Teacher Performance Standards</p> <p>State Approval of Teacher Education Programs, NASDTEC, NCATE</p> <p>Conducting program reviews</p> <p>Chaminade University of Honolulu Report</p> <p>University of Hawaii at Manoa Report</p> <p>University of Hawaii - Student Teaching Sample</p>	Need more information	<p>Hawaii Teacher Standards Board</p> <p>Teacher Performance Standards</p> <p>Materials for the Preparation of Special Educators (pg. 47-53)</p> <p>Chaminade University of Honolulu Report</p> <p>University of Hawaii at Manoa Report</p>	Need more information	<p>Hawaii Teacher Standards Board</p> <p>Licensing and Certification Policy</p> <p>State Approval of Teacher Education Programs, NASDTEC, NCATE</p> <p>Conducting program reviews</p> <p>Chaminade University of Honolulu Report</p> <p>University of Hawaii at Manoa Report</p>	Accreditation Procedures and Standards Comparable
36. New York	<p>Certification Requirements, Part 52: pg. 5-10</p> <p>Standards for Approval of Teacher Education Programs: pg. 6-11</p> <p>General Requirements for Teacher Education Programs</p> <p>Teaching to Higher Standards</p>	Yet to be reviewed	<p>Certification Requirements, Part 52: pg. 5-10</p> <p>Standards for Approval of Teacher Education Programs: pg. 16-22</p> <p>Teaching to Higher Standards</p>	Yet to be reviewed	<p>Certification Requirements, Part 52: pg. 5-10</p> <p>Standards for Approval of Teacher Education Programs: pg. 6-11</p> <p>Teaching to Higher Standards</p>	Need more information
37. North Dakota	<p>Education Standards and Practices Board: Teacher Education Program Approval: Chapters 6,7,8</p> <p>Teacher Certification Section 67</p>	Need more information	<p>Education Standards and Practices Board: Teacher Education Program Approval: Chapters 8.11 (pg. 7), 8.23, and 9.9</p>	Need more information	<p>Education Standards and Practices Board: Teacher Education Program Approval: Chapters 1-6, 9</p> <p>Procedures for Program Approval</p>	Accreditation Procedures and Standards Comparable
38. Alaska	Teacher Education Standards	Yet to be reviewed	Need special education standards	Yet to be reviewed	<p>Teacher Education Standards</p> <p>Protocol for Continuing Accreditation/Approval</p>	Need more information
39. Iowa	Standards for Practitioner Preparation Programs	Yet to be reviewed	Standards for Practitioner Preparation Programs	Yet to be reviewed	<p>Standards for Practitioner Preparation Programs</p> <p>Manual of Instructions for Preparation of the Institutional Report</p>	Decision pending approval of draft revised standards
40. Texas	<p>Standards for Teacher Education</p> <p>Teacher Certification Handbook</p>	Accreditation Procedures and Standards Not Comparable	<p>Standards for Teacher Education</p> <p>Teacher Certification Handbook</p>	Accreditation Procedures and Standards Not Comparable	<p>Standards for Teacher Education</p> <p>Teacher Certification Handbook</p>	Accreditation Procedures and Standards Not Comparable
	Policies,	Need more	Policies,	Yet to be	Policies, Procedures,	Accreditation

	Procedures, Unit Standards, and Licensure Area Standards for Teacher Education Program Approval in South Carolina Approved Teacher Education Programs	information	Procedures, Unit Standards, and Licensure Area Standards for Teacher Education Program Approval in South Carolina Approved Teacher Education Programs	reviewed	Unit Standards, and Licensure Area Standards for Teacher Education Program Approval in South Carolina Approved Teacher Education Programs	Procedures and Standards Comparable
42. Oklahoma	Competencies for Licensure and Certification Standards and Criteria for Oklahoma Accredited Teacher Education Programs and Institutional Plan Guidelines	Yet to be reviewed	Competencies for Licensure and Certification (pg. 49-59)	Need more information	Standards and Criteria for Oklahoma Accredited Teacher Education Programs and Institutional Plan Guidelines	Accreditation Procedures and Standards Comparable



[Back to the Top](#) |
[Back to July 1999 Agenda](#)
[Return to "Agenda Archives"](#) |
[Return to "About CTC"](#) |





California Commission on Teacher Credentialing

Meeting of: July 7-8, 1999

Agenda Item Number: PREP-5

Committee: Preparation Standards

Title: The Governor's Proposed Budget for BTSA Programs in 1999-2000: Plan for Statewide Program Expansion

✓ Action

Prepared by: Dr. Phil Fitch, Consultant
Professional Services Division

Summary of an Agenda Report

The Governor's Proposed Budget for BTSA Programs in 1999-2000: Plan for Statewide Program Expansion

**Professional Services Division
June 22, 1999**

Executive Summary-Overview

The Governor's Budget and the Budget Bill for FY1999-2000 provides funding for statewide BTSA program expansion and implementation. This agenda item provides a recommendation that the commission endorse the policies and procedures that the State Superintendent and Commission adopted for BTSA program expansion for FY1998-99. The BTSA Program experienced significant growth during 1998-99 as the adopted policies and procedures were implemented statewide by the BTSA Task Force.

The agenda item includes information regarding the four pilot years (1988-92) of the California New Teachers Project (CNTP), the legislative enactment of the present Beginning Teacher Support and Assessment (BTSA) System, its purposes and the current status of the BTSA Budget 1998-99 and the proposed budget for 1999-2000. The policy issues and options that were presented to the Commission a year ago are presented along with the options approved by the Commission at that time.

The enclosed plan for statewide BTSA expansions will allow all 125 currently-funded BTSA programs to serve all eligible first and second year teachers in their participating districts. These programs would also be invited to add districts in close geographic proximity for each of the five Cluster areas. The Cluster Consultants will also contact all districts and county offices that are not currently participating in BTSA to encourage them to do so. The agenda item ends with a staff recommendation and a delineation of State and Cluster Costs and the total proposed BTSA Budget of 1999-2000.

Policy Issues to be Resolved

The following policy questions are addressed in this agenda item.

- Does the Commission wish to continue to endorse the 1998-99 policies and procedures for BTSA expansion and implementation for the FY1999-2000?
- Are there other issues or policies for BTSA expansion in 1999-2000 that should be discussed and reviewed by the Commission?

Staff Recommendation

Staff recommends that the Commission continue with the previously (August 1998) approved policy guidelines for statewide expansion of BTSA.

The Governor's Proposed Budget for BTSA Programs in 1999-2000: Plan for Statewide Program Expansion

**Professional Services Division
June 22, 1999**

Part One: Background Information

The Beginning Teacher Support and Assessment (BTSA) Program was established by the Legislature and Governor Wilson as a consequence of a pilot study by the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing and the California Department of Education, which was called the California New Teacher Project (CNTP). This initial section of the report describes the BTSA Program, its origins in the CNTP, its purposes, and the current status of the BTSA budget.

Building BTSA on the Research Findings of the Pilot Study

The California New Teacher Project was a large-scale pilot project to test alternative models for (1) supporting and assisting the professional induction of first-year and second-year teachers, and (2) assessing their competence and performance in the classroom. During its "peak" year (1990-91), the CNTP included 37 local pilot programs; over the entire four years, more than 3,000 beginning teachers and more than 1,500 experienced teachers participated in the CNTP.

Because the California New Teacher Project was seen primarily as a pilot effort to inform future policy directions, significant time and resources were devoted to evaluation and research activities over the course of the four years. Lawmakers required that each alternative program of support and assessment be evaluated in terms of the following criteria:

- effectiveness at retaining in teaching those individuals who show promise of becoming expert professionals;
- effectiveness at improving the pedagogical content knowledge and skills of the beginning teachers who are retained;
- effectiveness at improving the ability of beginning teachers to teach students who are ethnically, culturally, economically, academically, and linguistically diverse;
- effectiveness at identifying beginning teachers who need additional assistance and, if that additional assistance fails, who should be removed from the education profession;
- the relative costs of each method in relation to its beneficial effects; and
- the extent to which each alternative method of supporting or assessing new teachers would, if it were added to the other state requirements for teaching credentials, make careers in education more or less appealing to prospective teachers.

The California Commission on Teacher Credentialing and the California Department of Education were given joint responsibility to administer the California New Teacher Project (1988-92) and to monitor the ongoing research activities. On the basis of competitive bids, the agencies selected two highly qualified external contractors to complete the research and evaluation work. The Southwest Regional Educational Laboratory (SWRL) evaluated the 37 support programs for new teachers. The Far West Laboratory (FWL) for Educational Research and Development evaluated existing and alternative forms of new teacher assessment.

Lawmakers also specified that the Commission and the Department be advised by a panel representing major educational organizations during the course of this pilot study. This advisory panel included representatives of the following organizations:

- California Teachers Association
- California Federation of Teachers
- United Teachers of Los Angeles
- Association of California School Administrators
- California State University
- University of California
- Association of Independent California Colleges and Universities
- California Council for the Education of Teachers
- California Association of Colleges for Teacher Education
- California School Boards Association
- California State Congress of Parents, Teachers and Students (PTA)

This panel played a key role in shaping the direction of research, reviewing the implications of interim reports, and informing the eventual policy recommendations.

At the conclusion of each year of the CNTP, the two research laboratories (SWRL and FWL) submitted detailed research findings in extensive technical reports to the Commission and the Department. During the fourth year (1991-92), the findings of three years of work were carefully summarized, synthesized and presented to the Commission and the Superintendent of Public Instruction. The most significant findings of the three-year pilot study were summarized in *Success for Beginning Teachers*, which was adopted by the Superintendent and the Commission and submitted to the Legislature. The policy recommendations in *Success for Beginning Teachers* were accurately reflected in Senate Bill 1422, the legislation by Senator Bergeson that the Commission sponsored to create the BTSA Program.

Summary of CNTP Pilot-Study Findings

In the final report of the CNTP, the Commission and the Department reported several significant findings. Fewer than half of California's school districts provide the support and training that beginning teachers need to become better teachers, remain in the teaching profession, and help their students become better learners. In addition, the current assessments of prospective and novice teachers do not effectively assure the public that teaching credentials are granted only to competent individuals. The CNTP demonstrated that intensive support, continued preparation and informative assessments of teachers in their first professional years result in significantly better instruction for students.

The pilot study report entitled, "*Success for Beginning Teachers: The California New Teacher Project*," included several significant policy recommendations. The Commission and the Department used the following terms to recommend that California be proactive in ensuring the success and verifying the effectiveness of all new teachers.

To increase beginning teacher success and effectiveness, state education policies governing teacher preparation, induction, credentialing and professional development need to be redesigned to provide for a better transition from *student of teaching* to *the role of teacher*. California needs to establish an integrated system of new teacher support and assessment, beginning with university preparation and continuing through induction into teaching. More effective induction of new teachers would include a gradual introduction to the norms and responsibilities of teaching, advice and assistance from experienced colleagues, and useful information about each teacher's performance compared to established expectations for what beginning teachers should know and be able to do. Sufficient state and local resources, including new funds as they become available, must be committed to the success of beginning teachers (*Success for Beginning Teachers*, pages 2-3).

In response to these recommendations, Governor Wilson established the Beginning Teacher Support and Assessment Program in the State Budget for 1992-93. After considerable discussion of *Success for Beginning Teachers* in 1992, the Legislature concurred with the Governor's proposal and included \$4.9 million for grants to initiate this new state program in local schools. In 1992-93, fifteen excellent local programs were funded in a competitive selection process designed to identify the most promising programs of support and assessment for new teachers. One year later (1993-94), a second invitation led to the selection of fifteen additional programs in districts and counties that were not included in the initial grants. From 1993-94 until 1995-96, the Department and the Commission maintained funding for the thirty BTSA Programs. During

these years, there were no opportunities to create new programs or to expand existing programs because of limitations in state budget resources.

Statutory Purposes of the BTSA Program

In 1997, the Legislature and Governor Wilson enacted Assembly Bill 1266 (Mazzoni), which established the following purposes of the BTSA System.

- To provide an effective transition into the teaching career for first-year and second-year teachers in California.
- To improve the educational performance of students through improved training, information, and assistance for new teachers.
- To enable beginning teachers to be effective in teaching students who are culturally, linguistically, and academically diverse.
- To ensure the professional success and retention of new teachers.
- To ensure that a support provider provides intensive individualized support and assistance to each participating beginning teacher..
- To improve the rigor and consistency of individual teacher performance assessments and the usefulness of assessment results to teachers and decision makers.
- To establish an effective, coherent system of performance assessments that are based on the California Standards for the Teaching Profession adopted by the commission in January, 1997.
- To examine alternative ways in which the general public and the educational profession may be assured that new teachers who remain in teaching have attained acceptable levels of professional competence.
- To ensure that an individual induction plan is in place for each participating beginning teacher and is based on an ongoing assessment of the development of the beginning teacher.
- To ensure continuous program improvement through ongoing research, development, and evaluation.

These ten purposes require the use of support and assessment standards to improve the performance of beginning teachers in order to maximize their students' learning opportunities. In 1997, AB 1266 charged the Commission and Superintendent to use standards of program quality and new teacher performance as the primary bases for approving local BTSA Programs.

BTSA Funding for Local Assistance Grants

The following chart shows the history of state funding for local assistance grants in the BTSA Program since its inception.

Fiscal Year	Funds for Local BTSA Grants
1992-93	\$ 4.9 Million
1993-94	5.0 Million
1994-95	5.2 Million
1995-96	5.5 Million
1996-97	7.5 Million
1997-98	17.5 Million
1998-99	66.0 Million
1999-00	72.0 Million

For the 1999-2000 fiscal year, Governor Davis has signed a budget bill which included a \$72.051 million budget for the BTSA Program. The following information is provided to assist Commissioners in their deliberations about policy directions and funding priorities for the 1999-2000 fiscal year, when a total of \$72.0 million would need to be allocated to local education agencies in California.

The following paragraphs provide a progress report on implementation of the BTSA expansion plan that was approved by the Commission in August, 1998.

**Part Two: BTSA Funding
Policy Issues and Options Approved for 1998-99**

The Governor's budget for 1998-99 included a budget of \$66 million. Based on the Governor's budget, in August 1998, the Commission and the Superintendent made policy decisions on how to allocate the funds. The following paragraphs set forth several policy issues that were resolved by the Commission and the Superintendent for a funding plan for 1998-99.

First BTSA Policy Issue: The State Agencies Should Maintain a Consistent Strategy for Including More Beginning Teachers in BTSA

Several alternative strategies could have been employed to expand the BTSA Program to include more new teachers who have completed their initial preparation. The approved option expanded programs in districts that are currently served *and* created new programs in districts that are were not previously served by existing funds. The dual goal of this option was to serve new teachers in more districts of the state, and in more schools within already-participating districts. The rationale for distributing funds to new *and* current BTSA Programs was based on the fact that many unserved new teachers fall within each of these two categories.

Second BTSA Policy Issue: The State Agencies Should Maintain a Consistent Strategy for Expanding Current BTSA Programs

The Commission made a decision about the factors to be considered in awarding additional funds to the existing BTSA Programs. The approved option was to expand the current BTSA Programs based primarily on the *effectiveness* of local programs, the strength of their evaluation data, and the quality of their expansion plans. Under this option, existing programs received added funds by demonstrating the effectiveness of their services, the rigor of their evaluation studies, and the quality of their expansion plans. The size of each excellent program's augmentation depended on the numbers of unserved beginning teachers who were teaching in the participating districts. The approved plan was based on the assumption that the most effective allocation of state funds would be according to the numbers of new teachers who are currently not served while assuring the quality of program expansion plans.

Third BTSA Policy Issue: The State Agencies Should Maintain a Consistent Strategy for Establishing Quality in New Programs

There are several ways in which BTSA augmentation funds could be used to create new BTSA Programs that offer excellent, effective services from the moment they begin operations. In the option that the Commission approved, the state agencies require the sponsors of "new" BTSA Programs to spend initial efforts on program planning and personnel preparations. Under this option, the *Standards of Program Quality and Effectiveness* are the basis for local planning and preparations. Additionally, the two agencies award small planning grants (not implementation grants) to districts that are selected to initiate new programs. The Commission and Department also select and invite current BTSA leaders to provide technical assistance to new BTSA Programs, to help them in answering questions and developing program plans. The vast majority of expansion funds are always spent on program operations, but these operations begin only after effective plans have been established locally.

Designing a new BTSA Program is a complex undertaking, not one that most districts can accomplish in a matter of weeks. During the ten years since the CNTF pilot study began, new induction programs have been immediately effective *only with the benefit of an initial planning period*. Experience in the 1997-98 year has confirmed that, even with expert assistance from experienced BTSA managers, new programs need most of a year to plan effective procedures for program implementation. This experience in initiating new induction programs demonstrates the need to provide small planning grants to local agencies that apply for funding. Each planning grant is small in comparison with the subsequent costs of actually supporting and assisting new teachers, but the planning time is needed for excellent services to be provided to those teachers. These strategies have previously been adopted for establishing quality in new programs.

Part Three: Plan for an 1998-99 BTSA Budget

Three-Phase Expansion Plan

In August 1998, the Commission approved a multi-phase Expansion Plan for 1998-99. Phase One of the expansion plan was approved in July 1998 by the Commission and the Superintendent for allocating \$10.5 million. The Phase One Plan, as adopted, is summarized below.

Phase One Augmentation Plan

In anticipation of the potential increase in funding for BTSA as proposed in May, the two state agency staffs conducted a survey in June, 1998 of currently-funded programs to determine each program's capacity to serve additional beginning teachers beginning in September, 1998. Program directors were advised to be conservative, and to base their projections on the numbers they could reasonably serve effectively. Included in the survey were considerations of identifying and preparing additional support providers, provisions

for release time, and the administrative needs of expanded programs.

Based on the telephone survey of all currently-funded programs and based on the quality of program improvement/expansion plans that were submitted in June by the same programs, the staff was confident the 82 currently-funded programs could serve up to 3,500 additional beginning teachers by September 1, 1998, for a total additional expansion of no more than \$10,500,000 (3,500 teachers X \$3,000 per teacher = \$10,500,000). This augmentation was the focus of the Phase One plan.

The purpose of Phase One of the new expansion plan was to take advantage of the capacity of currently-funded programs to select and serve more beginning teachers before the fall semester began. Phase One of the expansion plan adhered to the policy options for previously funded programs that the Commission adopted. Based on the Commission's action of July 23, 1998, each of the 82 programs received the expanded funding on an expedited basis if they submit an expansion plan with a new program budget for review and approval as soon as the State Budget is signed. The two state agencies notified programs of these awards within two weeks after the budget was signed, to allow them to select both support providers and beginning teachers early, and to start the necessary training and preparation to be able to serve the additional teachers effectively by September 1, 1998.

Phase II and III Expansion Proposal

Phase Two and Phase Three of the expansion plan adhered to the policy options for previously funded programs that the Commission adopted. The Phase Two Plan allowed BTSA Programs to begin serving additional beginning teachers in January 1999. The Phase Three Plan would allow local programs to begin serving still more beginning teachers in starting July 1, 1999.

Currently-Funded Programs that Originated in 1992-93 Through 1996-97

For the first time, the 34 currently funded programs that began implementation in any of the years from 1992-93 through 1996-97 were invited to serve all eligible new teachers in their participating districts. These programs were also invited to add districts in close geographic proximity that are not already being served. Each program that added eligible beginning teachers in January, 1999, was required to submit an *Expansion Plan*, including a budget. To include more eligible new teachers in July, 1999, required a second *Expansion Plan* with a new budget.

Currently-Funded Programs that Originated in 1997-98

Currently funded programs that received planning and implementation grants in 1997-98 (40 programs), or that split-off from larger programs (eight programs), were invited to serve all eligible beginning teachers in their participating districts. These programs would also be invited to add districts in close geographic proximity that are not being served.

Programs Currently Planning with the Use of Planning Grants

The 30 districts or consortia of districts that recently earned planning grants had the opportunity to develop implementation plans to serve no fewer than 50 eligible first- and second-year teachers and as many as the total number of eligible beginning teachers in the participating district(s). These grant recipients received expert technical and programmatic assistance from their assigned Cluster Consultants.

Districts Not Currently Participating in BTSA

Within their regions, each of the five Cluster Consultants contacted all districts that were not currently participating in BTSA to encourage them to do so. Districts that choose to apply for BTSA funding were offered a choice of the two options listed below.

Option One: Receiving a Planning Grant. Each school district not participating in BTSA was invited to apply for a planning grant of \$10,000 for the purpose of developing a new BTSA Program. During the planning period, which could take six months, the planning grant recipients received expert technical and programmatic assistance from their assigned Cluster Consultants. These programs were required to develop *Program Implementation Plans* based on the 13 Program Quality Standards to serve no fewer than 50 eligible first- and second-year teachers and as many as the total number of eligible beginning teachers in the participating district(s).

Option Two: Joining a Currently-Funded Program. Alternatively, each school district not participating in BTSA was invited to initiate contact with a currently funded BTSA Program that might be able to include the non-funded district in a consortium arrangement. The

Cluster Consultants were responsible for facilitating conversations between non-funded districts and currently funded programs for the purpose of exploring potential linkages. Currently funded programs that added new districts were required to submit expansion plans and budgets that include the new districts.

Appointment of BTSA Cluster Consultants and Professional Development Leaders

In February 1998 the Commission approved an expansion plan that included the appointment of five BTSA Cluster Consultants to assist new programs in planning effective services and in preparing for the delivery of those services. BTSA Cluster Consultants were to be selected from the most experienced personnel within current BTSA Programs. Their functions are to assist other programs within their regions, and to guide new programs in the planning process and in preparation for new program implementation. In 1998-99, each BTSA Cluster Consultant worked with approximately twenty-five programs, including planning grant recipients, newly funded programs, and previously-funded programs. The Consultants provided technical support to single programs and to cluster-groups of programs. The Consultants will continue to:

- Assist induction programs in designing, implementing, refining, and evaluating their services to beginning teachers.
- Assist induction programs in building capacity to provide professional services to all personnel involved in local programs.
- Disseminate information about teacher induction programs to all participants within each regional cluster.
- Collaborate with other Consultants statewide and with state administrative staff to ensure ongoing program improvement.

As the number of programs and beginning teachers participating in the programs more than doubled in size, the Commission and Superintendent in August 1998 approved a plan to increase the number of Cluster Consultants to provide excellent services to programs. With a local assistance budget of \$66.0 million in 1998-99, the 125 local programs needed the services of an additional six Cluster Consultants to adequately support current and new programs. Rather than increase the number of clusters to eleven the BTSA Taskforce decided it was more effective to create two member professional teams to assist each of the five clusters. The second professional position created is called a Professional Development Leader. The Professional Development Leaders will assist induction programs in building capacity to provide professional development services to all personnel involved in local programs. The professional training that they will assist in will include CFASST, Site Administrator training, Towards Equity training, and BTSA Program Leadership training. In addition, Los Angeles United School District will receive their own Professional Development Leader to assist with all the training needed by LAUSD.

Status of BTSA Expansion July 1999

The expenditure plan approved by the Commission, discussed above, was implemented by the BTSA Taskforce. However, the Department of Finance allowed the BTSA Taskforce to allocate only \$45.6 million of the 1998-99 budget of \$66.0 million. The remaining \$20.4 million was withheld to become part of the \$72.051 million 1999-2000 BTSA budget.

Eighty-six programs served beginning teachers for the entire year. Ten of these districts took advantage of the Phase Two expansion plan. In these 86 programs, 12,410 beginning teachers were served. Thirty-nine programs received planning grants and will begin to serve beginning teachers in July 1999. In 1998-99, a cost of living increase of \$150 per beginning was added to the \$3000 per beginning teacher cost to increase the per teacher allotment to \$3150.00.

Plan for BTSA Expansion in 1999-2000 and Staff Recommendations

The Governor's budget for 1999-2000 included a budget of \$72.051 million. In August 1998, the Commission and the Superintendent made policy decisions on how to allocate the funds for 1998-99 and approved a plan for allocation of these funds.

Staff recommends that the Commission continue with the previously approved policy guidelines. The plan outlined below for allocating the 1999-2000 BTSA budget is based on these policy guidelines and is similar to the expenditure plan that was used for the 1998-99 fiscal year.

Phase III Expansion Plan From 1998-99

The Phase Three Plan approved in August, 1998, would allow local programs to begin

serving still more beginning teachers in July 1, 1999. One hundred and twenty-five programs submitted their initial implementation or expansion plans for serving beginning teachers 1999-2000. The total number of teachers that funds were requested for is approximately 22,000. In addition a cost of living adjustment will increase the per teacher allocation to \$3200. This projected expenditure is $(22,000 \times \$3200)$ \$70.4 million.

Ian For January 2000 Program Expansion

All 125 currently funded programs will be invited to serve all eligible new teachers in their participating districts. These programs will also be invited to add districts in close geographic proximity that are not already being served. Each program that wants to add eligible beginning teachers in January, 2000, will be required to submit an *Expansion Plan*, including a budget. We expect that as many as 3000 additional teachers may be added in January and will receive BTSA services for the remainder of the school year. This projected expenditure is $(3000 \times \$1600)$ \$4.8 million.

Districts Not Currently Participating in BTSA

Within their regions, each of the five Cluster Consultants will need to contact all districts that are not currently participating in BTSA to encourage them to do so. Districts that choose to apply for BTSA funding will be offered a choice of the two options listed below.

Option One: Receiving a Planning Grant. Each school district not participating in BTSA will be invited to apply for a planning grant of \$10,000 for the purpose of developing a new BTSA Program. During the planning period, which could take six months, the planning grant recipients received expert technical and programmatic assistance from their assigned Cluster Consultants. These programs will be required to develop *Program Implementation Plans* based on the 13 Program Quality Standards to serve no fewer than 50 eligible first- and second-year teachers and as many as the total number of eligible beginning teachers in the participating district(s). We project that as many as ten additional programs may receive planning grants for an additional expenditure of $(10 \times \$10,000)$ \$100,000.

Option Two: Joining a Currently-Funded Program. Alternatively, each school district not participating in BTSA will be invited to initiate contact with a currently funded BTSA Program that might be able to include the non-funded district in a consortium arrangement. The Cluster Consultants will be responsible for facilitating conversations between non-funded districts and currently funded programs for the purpose of exploring potential linkages. Currently funded programs that want to add new districts will be required to submit expansion plans and budgets that include the new districts.

Other Cluster or State Costs and Total Budget

Cluster Consultants (5 x \$150,000)	\$750,000
Professional Development Leaders (6 x \$150,000)	\$900,000
Training Funds (Training Delivery & Revisions)	\$720,000
State Survey	\$225,000
Total Non-Local Program Costs	\$2,595,000
BTSA Services Beginning July (22,000 BTs x \$3,200)	\$70,400,000
BTSA Services Beginning Jan. (2,000 BTs x \$1,600)	\$4,800,000
Planning Grants (10 x \$10,000)	\$100,000
Total State BTSA Funds for Local Programs	\$75,300,000
BTSA Matching Funds Beginning July (22,000 x \$2,000)	\$44,000,000
BTSA Matching Funds Beginning Jan. (3,000 x \$1,000)	\$3,000,000
Total Matching Funds	\$47,000,000
Total State BTSA Funds for Local Programs	\$75,300,000
Total Matching Funds	\$47,000,000

Total State & Local BTSA Budget for Local Programs \$122,300,000


Total State BTSA Funds for Local Programs \$75,300,000

Total Non-Local Program Costs \$2,595,000

Total State BTSA Budget \$77,895,000

A further point needs to be made concerning these budget tables:

- Total projected program costs (\$77,895,000) exceed 1999-2000 BTSA Budget (\$72,051,000). We will be able to make up this difference because we were able to forward fund money from FY1998-99 budget to pay for FY1999-2000.




| [Back to the Top](#) |

| [Back to July 1999 Agenda](#)

|

| [Return to "Agenda Archives"](#) |

| [Return to "About CTC"](#) |





California Commission on Teacher Credentialing

Meeting of: July 7-8, 1999

Agenda Item Number: PREP-6

Committee: Preparation Standards

Title: Draft Progress Report to the Legislature on the Status of the Paraprofessional Teacher Training Program

✓ **Action**

Prepared by: Marilyn Fairgood, Assistant Consultant
Professional Services Division

Draft Progress Report to the Legislature on the Status of the Paraprofessional Teacher Training Program

June 23, 1999

Executive Summary

The State Budget for 1998-99 included an appropriation from the General Fund to enable the Commission to continue to fund local education agencies that create career ladders for school paraprofessionals who would like to become certificated teachers. Education Code Section §44393 calls for delivery of a Paraprofessional Program Progress Report in 1999. During May and June, the staff compiled all of the currently-available information about the 13 local projects in the program. For review and discussion on July 8, attached is a *draft* progress report.

Policy Issues to be Resolved

How well is the Paraprofessional Teacher Training Program progressing toward achieving its goals of teacher recruitment, teacher retention and teacher diversity in fields of teacher shortage, especially special education and bilingual education?

Fiscal Impact Summary

Compiling and drafting the Progress Report has been funded from the base budget of the Professional Services Division. The report can be completed, published and forwarded to the Legislature without an augmentation or redirection of resources.

Relationship to Commission's Strategic Goals and Objectives

Goal: Work with schools of education, the Department of Education, and school districts to assure quality teachers.

Objective: Take a leadership role in recruiting and preparing qualified teachers in response to class size reduction

Recommendations

That the Commission consider the information contained in the following revised Paraprofessional Teacher Training Program Progress Report, adopt the report, authorize the Executive Director to submit it to the Legislature, and authorize the staff to forward copies of the report to interested

organizations and individuals.

Important Note

The following report contains important information that is relevant to the Commission's policy deliberations but could not be summarized in the above space.

[Click here for table of Contents](#)

STATE OF CALIFORNIA

CALIFORNIA COMMISSION ON TEACHER CREDENTIALING



**THE CALIFORNIA SCHOOL PARAPROFESSIONAL
TEACHER TRAINING PROGRAM**

A PROGRESS REPORT TO THE LEGISLATURE

JUNE 23, 1999

The California Commission on Teacher Credentialing

**State of California
Gray Davis, Governor
June 1999**

Commission Members

Torrie L. Noron, Chair	Elementary School Teacher
Gary E. Reed, Vice Chair	Public Representative
Melodie Blowers	School Board Member
Verna B. Dauterive	School Administrator
Carolyn L. Ellner	Higher Education Representative
Scott Harvey	Public Representative
Carol Katzman	Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction
Helen Lee	Public Representative
Doris Miner	School Counselor

Edmund Sutro
Jane Veneman
Nancy Zarenda

High School Teacher
Special Education Teacher
Elementary School Teacher

Ex-Officio Members Representing:

Edward DeRoche

Association of Independent California
Colleges and Universities

Elizabeth Graybill

Postsecondary Education Commission

Jon Snyder

Regents, University of California

Bill Wilson

California State University

Executive Officer

Sam W. Swofford

Executive Director

**The California School Paraprofessional
Teacher Training Program:
A Progress Report to the Legislature**

Responsible Staff Members

Dennis Tierney, Division Director

Joe Dear, Consultant in Teacher Preparation Program Evaluation

Marilynn Fairgood, Assistant Consultant in Teacher Preparation Program Evaluation

Professional Services Division
California Commission on Teacher Credentialing

Report Contents

Executive Summary of the Report

Introduction to the Paraprofessional Program

Progress Report on the Program Sites

Program Accomplishments

Introduction to the Status Report

Current Status of the Paraprofessional Teaching Program

Status Report Data Tables

Conclusions

(NOTE: Appendices not included with this DRAFT REPORT, but will be included in the FINAL REPORT)

Appendix A: Chapter 1444 of the Statutes of 1990, Which Established the California Paraprofessional Teacher Training Program

Appendix B: Chapters 737 and 831 of the Statutes of 1997, Which Authorized Expansion of the California School Paraprofessional Teacher Training Program

Appendix C: News Articles in California Newspapers Regarding the California Paraprofessional Teacher Training Program

Appendix D: Descriptions of the California School Paraprofessional Teacher Training Program in Published Works

**The California School Paraprofessional
Teacher Training Program:
A Progress Report to the Legislature**

**California Commission on Teacher Credentialing
June 18, 1999**

Executive Summary

The California School Paraprofessional Teacher Training Program was established by legislation authored by Senator David Roberti (SB 1636) in 1990. With the signature of Governor George Deukmejian, SB 1636 became Chapter 1444 of the Statutes of 1990. With amendments, this statute appears in Appendix A at the end of this report.

The primary purpose of the California School Paraprofessional Teacher Training Program is to create local career ladders

that enable school paraprofessionals to become certificated classroom teachers. School paraprofessionals are teachers' assistants, library-media aides and instructional assistants who contribute to the education of hundreds of thousands of students in K-12 public schools. The Legislature created the program to respond to teacher shortages, improve the instructional services that are provided by school paraprofessionals, diversify the teaching profession, and establish innovative models for teacher education. Follow-up legislation (Chapter 1220, Statutes of 1991) required that the program focus on the recruitment of paraprofessionals to specialize as bilingual and special education teachers.

Funding for the program was included in the State Budget for the first time in 1994. The 1994-95 budget contained \$1.478 million in local assistance funds for implementation of the program, and a \$60,000 addition to the Commission's budget to administer the program. Since then, the program has consisted of a total of 13 program sites that currently serve 580 participants. The program includes 14 California Community Colleges and 14 California State University campuses. The 13 local programs have been operational since January 1995.

The core of the program consists of academic scholarships to defray the costs of tuition, books and fees for paraprofessionals who complete college and university coursework to meet teacher certification standards by earning college degrees and teaching credentials. Most of the paraprofessionals enter the program having previously completed relatively few college courses. All of the program participants continue to serve as part-time paraprofessionals in K-12 schools while they enroll as part-time students in colleges and universities. Because of these circumstances, completion of the program requires a long-term commitment by the program participants and the State of California. Although some of the original participants in the 1995 cohort have completed the program and accepted positions as classroom teachers, this report is an interim report because most of the original cohort members are still making satisfactory progress toward the completion of degrees and credentials.

Chapters 737 and 831, Statutes of 1997, authorized expansion of the program and re-named it the Wildman-Keeley-Solis Exemplary Teacher Training Act of 1997 (Education Code Sections §44390-§44393). No funding, however, was provided in 1997 to expand the program as required by law. These statutes appear in Appendix B at the end of this report.

Section §44393 of the Education Code requires the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing to report to the Legislature regarding the status of the California School Paraprofessional Teacher Training Program. According to this statute, the report to the Legislature is to include information regarding the number of paraprofessionals recruited, the academic progress of the school paraprofessionals, the number of paraprofessionals recruited who are subsequently employed as teachers in the public schools, the degree to which the program meets the demand for bilingual and special education teachers, the degree to which the program or similar programs can meet that demand if properly funded and executed, and other effects of the program on the operation of the public schools.

In January 1999 Governor Gray Davis identified the California School Paraprofessional Teacher Training Program as an important element of his education initiative, Enhancing Professional Quality. Because Governor Davis believes strongly in the value of paraeducators and supports the establishment of meaningful paraeducator career ladders which lead to both enhanced responsibilities for paraeducators and teacher certification, he is proposing a \$10 million dollar augmentation for the program for the 1999-2000 fiscal year.

This report is the Commission's second progress report to the Legislature pursuant to Section §44393 of the Education Code. With the \$10 million dollar proposed augmentation the number of program participants will increase by thousands. The final participant under the existing program is scheduled to graduate in 2003 and the existing program will be phased out. Thus, this will be the final report which includes information on the existing 13 programs only. By 2003, we anticipate that all 580 of the current participants will have attained full certification. Therefore, all future reports to the Legislature will focus on programs and participants included in the program expansion. Once additional data are compiled and analyzed, the Commission will submit additional progress reports to the Legislature.

Introduction to the California School

Paraprofessional Teacher Training Program

Since 1994-95, when the Paraprofessional Teacher Training Program was initially funded, it has enabled 195 school paraprofessionals to become certificated classroom teachers, and has enabled 580 other paraprofessionals to approach their goal of becoming certificated teachers. The program has achieved these successes by creating career ladders that reward successful paraprofessionals with increasing responsibilities and compensation.

The Legislature and Governor established the program to address several key issues and challenges in California's public schools, including: the shortage of teachers, the value of improving instructional services to K-12 students, the need to diversify the teaching profession, and the opportunity to explore innovative models for teacher education. The statute called for the Commission to realize these goals by awarding grants, through a competitive process, to several school districts or county offices of education, who would implement the program at local sites.

In August 1994, the Commission adopted a plan for implementing the Paraprofessional Teacher Education Program. Four months later the Executive Director selected and the Commission confirmed thirteen sites to receive grants. These 13 program sites are located throughout the state, and have been operational since January 1995. In September 1996, the Commission resolved several policy questions about filling vacant positions in the local programs and replacing individual participants who complete the local programs prior to other members of their cohorts. The Commission decided to allow

local project directors to fill vacated positions with new paraeducators who would come into the program at academic levels that parallel the current levels of the continuing participants in the program. This decision maximizes the productivity of the program without unnecessarily prolonging the duration of the local assistance grant awards.

The Commission also decided that, when cohorts of participants graduate from the existing local programs, the Executive Director will issue a new Request for Proposals for the purpose of inviting other school districts or county offices of education to participate in the Paraprofessional Teacher Education Program. This would happen when all (or nearly all) of the participants complete a local program. The Commission will, however, honor those program designs that included more than one cohort in their original proposals.

At its inception in 1995, the total number of program participants was 566. The number of individuals participating in the program since 1995 has fluctuated, normally and predictably, during various points of program development. Currently, the program includes 118 male and 462 female paraprofessionals. The goal of each paraprofessional is to attain full teacher certification. To attain full certification an individual must earn a baccalaureate degree and complete a teacher preparation program. A full-time student with no prior collegiate coursework would typically complete the baccalaureate and teacher preparation requirements in five years of full-time study. Each participant's coursework in the program depends in part on prior coursework because the participants are not allowed to enroll in courses they completed previously.

Since January 1995, the prior academic experience of program participants varied from completion of little or no postsecondary coursework (0 - 6 units) to completion of extensive prior coursework (90 or more units). As a result, the participants enter the program at different levels of academic attainment, and they enroll in postsecondary institutions as freshmen, sophomores, juniors and seniors. To maximize the productivity of the program, the Commission requires that local sponsors admit participants in *cohorts* such that all members of a cohort begin with approximately equal levels of prior coursework. This requirement also fosters the success of the program participants by emphasizing the important role of *peer support* as the participants progress through their collegiate and professional studies.

All of the participants must continue to work as part-time paraprofessionals during their enrollment in the program. To remain in the program, they must also adhere to its academic standards, including completion of a minimum number of units per quarter/semester, and maintenance of a minimum grade point average. Additionally, most of the participants have families, and many of them function as the heads of their households. Because of these professional, academic and personal requirements, almost all of the program participants are part-time students. Taking all of these factors into consideration, it will take as many as seven years of part-time study for a participant who has finished little or no prior coursework to earn a baccalaureate degree and complete a teacher education program. While the participants' status as part-time students has the effect of prolonging their completion of the program, it does not increase the program's overall costs, because the part-time enrollees are charged part-time college and university tuition fees.

Thus far, the program has produced an impressive number of graduates in a relatively short period of time. A total of 195 participants have become fully-certificated teachers during the four years since 1995. Of the 195 graduates, 45 had completed extensive coursework prior to entering the program, and a few of them had previously earned baccalaureate degrees. Nevertheless, all of the 195 participants achieved full certification as classroom teachers less than four years after entering the program. The Commission anticipates that 177 additional participants will graduate with full teacher certification within the next one to two years. This will bring to 372 the program's output in terms of the total number of fully-certificated teachers it will have produced for California's public schools. To evaluate the success and effectiveness of the California School Paraprofessional Teacher Training Program, its productivity should be viewed in light of fact that all of the participants must work and maintain families and households while they complete college and university casework for academic degrees and professional certification.

Progress Report on the Program Sites

The Commission's staff recently visited the program sites in order to become familiar with how each site has implemented the statutory program. The staff found that the local programs are being implemented in compliance with the law.

Program sites have utilized various approaches to implement the state law. There are, however, some common components among the programs. A key common component is the support that is provided to the participants, as mandated by law. Besides the financial support that the Commission provides, personal support comes from three different sources: local education agency support, college and university support, and cohort support.

Local Education Agency Support. The first sources of support for paraprofessionals in career ladders are the local education agencies. Support by school districts takes many different forms, including: tutoring, California Basic Educational Skills Test (CBEST) preparation training, Multiple Subject Assessment for Teachers (MSAT) preparation training, mentoring, and in-kind contributions. At each of the sites, the project coordinator establishes an accountability relationship with each paraeducator by reviewing transcripts and obtaining grade reports at the conclusion of each semester. This enables the coordinator to discern if the paraeducator is positively progressing through the program. If the paraeducator is not making progress, then the coordinator can refer the individual to a particular tutoring session that is provided either by the school district or by the college or university. In many cases a paraeducator obtains informal tutoring from a certificated teacher at the school of employment, which supplemented formal instruction in the program.

Basic skills tutoring and CBEST preparation are other forms of support that school districts offer to the participants. Most of the program sites attempt to prepare the paraeducators for the CBEST early in their academic pursuits, so they may attempt the CBEST and pass the examination while their academic skills are in active use. Many paraeducators had a foreboding concern for the CBEST, but those concerns were somewhat alleviated by the training and tutoring.

Paraeducators are also having success with the CBEST due, in part, to the training and tutoring that each local site provides.

Success for paraeducators can also be attributed to the mentoring programs that some of the projects provide. The Los Angeles Unified School District program site selects a teacher to serve as a Support Provider or Mentor for the cohort. The duties and responsibilities of the Support Provider include, but are not limited to: guiding paraeducators along the career path, assisting paraeducators in finding individual training opportunities and demonstration activities for performance assessments, and guiding paraeducators through district bureaucracy. The San Francisco Unified School District program site has created a Peer Mentoring Program in which each paraeducator is matched with a teacher at the school of the paraeducator's employment. The roles of the teacher or mentor are to support and advise the paraeducator, and to include the paraeducator in professional networks. According to paraeducators in these mentor programs, the mentors provide moral support that encourages the paraeducators to persevere in their pursuit of teaching credentials, which they feel is a "much-needed push."

Local education agencies also demonstrate their support with in-kind contributions that include office space for study groups or cohort meetings, consumable supplies, equipment rental, staff time, and release time for the paraeducators. A description of the types of support provided by local education agencies can be found in [Data Table 2](#).

College and University Support. The second source of support is the college or university. According to a report by Recruiting New Teachers entitled *Breaking the Class Ceiling: Paraeducator Pathways to Teaching*, academic advising is crucial to the success of the paraeducator. The report stated:

Academic advising heads the list of essential support services in paraeducator programs precisely because program coordinators realize it can often be such a hit-or-miss affair at many institutions. Student Services officials usually do not assign advisors to students who attend part-time, in the evenings, on weekends, or during the summer term. Even when faculty advisors are routinely assigned, paraeducators typically get little or no academic advising because they cannot drop work or family responsibilities during the day to stop in for a chat during posted faculty office hours. It's not uncommon for a paraeducator program applicant to present a transcript with 130 credits that lead absolutely nowhere--a legacy of failed advisement regarding course selection in the past. In all too many cases, participants with years of class-room experience enroll in introductory courses they might have waived, if they had been better advised. Similarly, many unwitting community college students take courses that universities won't accept for transfer credit. Careful academic advising is critical to prevention of these unnecessary obstacles to academic accomplishment.

All thirteen program sites provide academic advisors for the paraeducators. Some sites offer both degree advisors and teaching credential advisors. This provides the participants with resources to navigate their way through their degree and credential programs. The Ventura County Office of Education program provides both kinds of advisors from the California State University, Northridge, for paraeducators who attend courses and are advised at the Northridge Extension Center in Ventura. The Lodi Unified School District project also provides both kinds of advising at the California State University, Stanislaus satellite campus at the Multiple Campus Regional Center in Stockton. The proximity of the advisors makes them readily available to the paraeducators. Some of the projects include college and university staff and administrators as members of their advisory councils, which gives the program visibility on the respective campuses.

The articulation problems that initially existed for those paraeducators who had completed community college coursework and were transferring to the California State University system have disappeared. Although some paraeducators lost some units early in the process, but they are now all on track with advisors who are committed to seeing them through the program without further delays. The paraeducators, for their part, report that they have not had any enrollment difficulties. This furthers the ease with which the paraeducators can complete the program as they are free from the anxiety of impacted courses.

A further description of selected financial and other resources is contained in [Data Table 12](#).

Cohort Support. In discussions with the paraeducators, the source of support most often mentioned is the support provided by the paraeducators themselves. This peer support takes many forms. Most of the local programs hold monthly or bimonthly cohort meetings where the paraeducators can discuss, with their fellow paraeducators, problems they may be having in college classes being taken, problems in the classrooms in which they are working and problems experienced on a personal level. Hearing how others have solved similar problems seems to give the paraeducators encouragement, and fosters a supportive and collegial environment within the cohort.

To maximize cohort support, the Program Directors hold cohort meetings and invite guest speakers to discuss topics that are relevant to the paraeducators. At a cohort meeting for the Merced Area Consortium, a speaker was brought in to discuss and give tips on storybook reading in the elementary classroom. At a cohort meeting for the Chula Vista Unified School District program, the Assistant Superintendent of Human Resources gave a presentation on teacher recruitment and the interview process. The Oakland Unified School District Program utilizes members of the cohort who have majored in mathematics to tutor other members so that they may be successful in passing the math portion of CBEST. The cohort also provides other forms of support such as car-pooling, a cohort library, and study groups, which some paraeducators feel are as important as other forms of support.

Participants thrive in this nurturing environment and in the knowledge that their struggle on the path towards teacher certification is not understood and appreciated by the program's administration. The personal commitment of time, which is well beyond what is compensated through the grant and by the local education agency, is a fundamental component of this

program. The program's extraordinary retention rate is due in part to the fact that participants know that their perseverance, struggles and commitment will all end with not only a fully-paid education resulting in a bachelor's degree, but with a full teaching credential and employment, with benefits.

Program Accomplishments

The Paraprofessional Teacher Preparation Program has enjoyed great success over the past four years. California has had the distinction of directing a teacher training program that has not only generated great interest from within our state as an effective career ladder model, but from organizations and other state education agencies across the nation. Since 1995, California Commission on Teacher Credentialing staff has presented numerous informational sessions regarding the success of the program. Two such presentations were made during the first (1998) and second (1999) annual California School Employees Association and California Department of Education statewide California Paraeducators Conference. Information regarding the program was also recently presented at the National Resource Center for Paraeducators National Conference in Little Rock Arkansas. Each of these sessions was well received with administrators in attendance expressing great interest in establishment of a program in their districts.

The success of the program must be directly attributed to the (1) type and level of support, guidance and assistance provided participants, which includes the personal nurturing of cohort members by program directors and coordinators and by postsecondary advisors and program coordinators, (2) full payment of tuition, other institutional fees and book costs, and (3) direct access to not only a local education agency contact person but access to a contact person at each community college and CSU campus.

Participants thrive in this nurturing environment and they identify this support as the number one reason for their continued perseverance in pursuit of a teaching credential while meeting all other family and employment obligations. The personal commitment of time devoted by program administrators and postsecondary staff, which is well beyond that which is compensated through the grant, is also a great factor in the success of program.

One of the major successes of the program is the collaboration that has begun to occur between school districts and postsecondary institutions. The unprecedented collaborative partnerships that currently exists as a result of this program has strengthened relationships between local education agencies and postsecondary institutions. Advisory councils comprised of school district administrators, college and university administrators and teacher representatives have been appointed. During one meeting at the Los Angeles Unified School District program site, which involved the school district, several area colleges and universities, and the local union, the colleges and universities discussed possible changes in the current articulation system to provide a smoother transition from the community colleges to the California State University campuses.

The California State University, Stanislaus, placed a Bilingual Crosscultural Language and Academic Development (BCLAD) program at the satellite campus at Multiple Campus Regional Center in Stockton. According to an academic advisor at the Lodi Unified School District program site, the Paraprofessional Teacher Education Program affected this change.

Another major success is the retention rate. Until recently, the program has boasted a 100 percent retention rate, however, one program graduate has recently joined the United States Peace Corps and will serve in an instructional capacity while in service. This brings the retention rate to 97 percent, which is still an impressive rate. The program's extraordinary retention rate is due, in part, to the fact that participants have experience in classroom settings. In most instances, participants have served in a classroom environment for more than eight years.

Overall, the Paraprofessional Teacher Training Program is progressing well. The local projects are using a significant range of program models, which will assist the Commission in its overall evaluation of the effectiveness of career ladder programs for the recruitment of teachers. Please see [Data Table 2](#) for a more detailed description of each program's features and accomplishments.

Introduction to the Status Report

Since its inception, each California School Paraprofessional Teacher Training Program has been required to report to the Commission on an annual basis. Each local program is asked to provide the following information:

- (1) The number and racial and ethnic classification of school paraprofessionals participating in the program.
- (2) The number and racial and ethnic classification of school paraprofessionals who have successfully completed the program.
- (3) The total annual cost per person participating in the pilot program, based upon all state, local, federal and other sources of funding.
- (4) The economic status of individuals participating in the program.
 - (a) The income range of the family
 - Under \$10,000
 - \$10,000-\$20,000
 - \$20,000-\$30,000
 - \$30,000-\$40,000
 - \$40,000-\$50,000
 - over \$50,000

Whether the paraeducator is the head of the household. The number of household members.

- (c) Whether the paraeducator pays for their own medical benefits.
- (5) A description of financial and other resources made available to the program by participating school districts, county offices of education, California Community Colleges, California State University campuses, and other participating organizations.
- (6) A budget that accounts for the grant funds used to date and projected expenses to the end of the calendar year.
- (7) The status of each participant in the program (units completed, projected time-to-degree, credential area, attending school full-time or part-time, courses taken in the last year).
- (8) A narrative description of the successes and challenges experienced to date in the implementation of the program, including any anticipated modifications to the program.
- (9) The status of the career ladder. (Is a career ladder in place? If so, does it include salary compensation? Is professional growth credit awarded?)

Current Status of the Paraprofessional Teacher Training Program

Most of the information contained in this report was compiled from Annual Reports by the 13 local programs. In addition to the Annual Reports, information is included from a few other sources such as the 1997 and 1999 site visits, the 1996 Project Summaries, and meetings with the program directors and coordinators in 1999. All data sources are included at the top of each data table in the following pages.

This program status report consists of 13 data tables and a conclusion. An analytic summary of each table is provided below. The summaries precede the corresponding tables.

Data Table 1: Common Attributes of Local Programs in the California School Paraprofessional Teacher Training Program

In addition to requirements mandated by statute and the grant conditions as established by the Commission, the 13 local California School Paraprofessional Teacher Training Programs have several excellent attributes that, although not "common" in the typical meaning of the word, are included in each local program. On the following two pages, [Table 1](#) describes these "common program components" that contribute to the success of the statewide program.

Data Table 2: Unique Local Program Features

Although the common components in [Table 1](#) significantly contribute to the success of the overall program, all of the local projects have unique features and incentives that provide additional support and motivation for program participants. Beginning on page 138, [Table 2](#) shows the unique support and program incentives that are offered in addition to the common components in [Table 1](#). For example, the unique features of local programs include: personal counseling, acknowledgment of participants' academic achievements, fiscal contributions that are equivalent to two hours per day for each program participant, and establishment of electronic mail accounts at no charge to the participants.

Data Table 3: Local Education Agency, California Community College and California State University Program Participants

State law mandates that participating local education agencies enter into articulation agreements with participating campuses of the California Community Colleges and/or California State University. Beginning on page 141, [Table 3](#) shows that the 13 existing local programs have entered into formal written articulation agreements with 14 campuses of the California Community Colleges and 14 California State University campuses. These K-12 partnerships with postsecondary institutions contribute to the program's goal of creating innovative teacher education models. Only the Glendale and Los Angeles Programs have no participants enrolled in community colleges and, therefore, no written articulation agreements with any campus of the California Community Colleges.

Status Report Data Table 1: Common Attributes of 13 Local Programs in the California School Paraprofessional Teacher Training Program

**(Data Sources: 1998-99 Annual Reports
and March 1999 Directors and Coordinators Meeting)**

- | | |
|-----|---|
| (1) | All 13 local programs include an extensive, in-depth assessment and selection process for potential participants. |
| (2) | All 13 local programs include a program administrative staff that consists of stakeholders who also serve as a decision-making body. |
| (3) | All 13 local programs include open and continuous communication between participants, program directors, program coordinators and local education agencies. |

- (4) All 13 local programs include personal nurturing by PTPP Directors, Coordinators, administrative staff, and teacher preparation program coordinators and counselors.
- (5) All 13 programs include highly successful collaboration efforts between local education agencies and institutions of postsecondary education.
- (6) All 13 programs include ongoing needs assessment and monitoring of the academic progress of each participant, including a personal needs assessment.
- (7) All 13 programs require that each participant complete a minimum number of units per quarter/semester. Participants must also maintain a minimum grade point average in order to remain in the program.
- (8) All 13 local programs include a billing process, established between the local education agencies and postsecondary institutions. This process is administered by each project's administrative staff and relieves participant anxieties regarding payment of tuition, other institutional fees and book costs.
- (9) All 13 programs include extensive support and assistance provided by each project's administrative staff, local education agencies and institutions of postsecondary education in order to facilitate each participant's expeditious progress through baccalaureate degree and professional preparation programs. Some support may include:
 - priority enrollment and entry into required courses for program participants;
 - tutorial support, and access to technology labs;
 - credential test preparation workshops and study sessions are provided several times per year;
 - regularly scheduled academic advising as well as informal personal counseling; and
 - theme specific workshops and guest lecturers present instructional methodology workshops throughout the year.
- (10) All 13 programs encourages peer mentoring.
- (11) All 13 programs include regularly-scheduled cohort meetings which are held throughout the year.
- (12) All 13 programs offer facilities, provided by the local education agencies and/or institutions of postsecondary education, for meetings, workshops, classes and social gatherings such as awards ceremonies.
- (13) All 13 local programs include flexible work schedules granted by local education agencies so that participants may attend college classes and cohort meetings.
- (14) All 13 local programs include a recognition luncheon/dinner or other gathering during which participants' efforts and achievements are acknowledged.
- (15) All 13 programs include a racial and ethnic make-up of participants which mirrors that of the student population of the local education agencies served by the projects.
- (16) All 13 local programs include facilitation of a seamless transition into the teaching profession by providing all those hired with Mentor Teacher Support, Beginning Teacher Support and Assessment (BTSA) Program participation, Alternative Certification Program and/or District Internship Program participation.
- (17) All 13 local programs receive the support of local education agency administrators as it is a popular program within each local education agency. The program is also perceived as producing quality teachers to serve in certification areas of high need.
- (18) All 13 programs include local education agencies that give special consideration in recruiting, interviewing and hiring because program graduates are often considered strong teacher candidates.
- (19) All 13 programs have played a major role in diversifying the teacher workforce for each participating local education agency by affecting a significant increase in the number of bilingual teachers hired.
- (20) All 13 local programs include the development and maintenance of program files and a Plan of Study for each participant.
- (21) All 13 programs have mutually benefited from partnerships between the postsecondary institutions and the local education agencies. As a result of these relationships, the program has helped to solidify partnerships between the participating institutions and various other career ladder programs within the local education agencies.
- (22) The Anaheim, Lodi and Ventura projects have a single academic advisor assigned to support program participants at each participating community college campus, and a single advisor at each participating California State University campus. These projects also include development of a 4-year Education Plan for each participant.

**Status Report Data Table 2:
Unique Features of Support for Paraprofessionals in 13 Local Programs**

**(Data Sources: 1996 Project Summaries, 1998-99
Annual Reports, and 1999 Directors/Coordinators Meeting)**

Program Sites	Unique Program Features In Addition To Common Attributes Included In Table 1
Anaheim Union High School District	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The District provides each participant with an electronic mail account. An Honor Roll has been established for participants who achieve a 3.0 grade point average.
Azusa Unified School District	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Participants have formed informal support groups beyond the academic setting. • 22 of the 30 participants currently have a

	grade point average above 2.75.
Chula Vista Elementary School District	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Program participants seeking Bilingual Crosscultural and Academic (BCLAD) authorizations complete their supervised teaching and 5th year of study at Parkview Elementary School. The school is coordinated and operated jointly by San Diego State University and Chula Vista Elementary School District. This collaboration is not within a university internship program. • The program grant is designed to cover costs of required state examinations and certification processing fees.
Clovis/Fresno Unified School District	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The program accepts only those individuals who have completed 90+ semester units of college/university course work. • Since its inception, more than one half of all program participants have been employed and are serving as fully certificated teachers or serving on internship credentials.
Glendale Unified School District	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Since its inception, 35 out of 55 participants have graduated from the program and are currently employed as fully certificated teachers. • Participants develop and maintain interactive journals which are submitted privately, several times per year, to the administrative team. Review of journal entries assist administrative staff in developing preventive measures to ward off potential problems for individuals, as well as developing staff development workshop topics for all participants. • The District provides each participant with an electronic mail account.
Lodi/Redding Consortium	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Counselors from the participating college/university campuses attend cohort meetings and arrange special classes designed to accommodate participants. These classes are conducted at a local school site and/or over the Internet.
Los Angeles Unified School District	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The District offers a yearly Career Ladder Institute retreat for cohort leaders and support providers. The institute, which also includes the participation of members of the LAUSD Career Ladder, affords participants an opportunity to develop and refine leadership skills and understand their connection and contributions to Career Ladder participants. The District assumes the cost of this intensive two-day retreat.
Merced Consortium	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The program offers native language classes for those participants who are orally proficient in their native language, but not academically proficient.
Oakland Unified School District	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The program has a 100% participant retention rate. • The program is successfully administered by a research group, in close collaboration with the Oakland Unified School District.

San Francisco Unified School District	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The District has gone beyond establishing a career ladder for paraprofessional advancement and has designated the paraprofessional classification a profession. • The District contributes the equivalent of 2 hours pay per day for each program participant, at a yearly cost of \$410,000.00.
San Jose Unified School District	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The cohort was initially comprised of paraprofessionals who had completed few post-secondary education courses. Currently, 23 of the 24 participants are enrolled in classes at the California State University level. • Although only one participant is enrolled in a teacher education program, 16 have taken the California Basic Educational Skills Test (CBEST). Nine of the 16 participants who have taken the test have passed the entire test.
Stockton Unified School District	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In addition to academic counseling and advisement, this project has formally established personal counseling for participants.
Ventura Consortium	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Ventura County Office of Education has instituted a Teacher Support Program which links the California School Paraprofessional Teacher Training Program, the Bilingual Teacher Recruitment Program, and the California State University Northridge Internship Credential Program. These three programs have produced more than 150 teachers for Ventura County schools.

Status Report Data Table 3:
Local Education Agency, California Community College and California State University Program Participants
(Data Source: 1998-99 Annual Reports)

Program Sites	Participating Local Education Agencies	Participating Campus of the California Community College	Participating Campus of the California State University
The Anaheim Program	Anaheim City School District Centralia School District Cypress School District Magnolia School District	Cypress Community College	California State University, Long Beach
The Azusa Program	Azusa Unified School District Charter Oak School District	Citrus Community College	California State University, Los Angeles
The Chula Vista Program	Chula Vista Elementary School District	Southwestern Community College	San Diego State University
The Clovis/Fresno	Clovis Unified School	Fresno City College	California State

Program	District Fresno Unified School District		University, Fresno
The Glendale Program	Glendale Unified School District	None	California State University, Los Angeles
The Lodi/Redding Program	Lodi Unified School District New Hope Elementary School District Galt Joint Union School District Enterprise School District Shasta County Office of Education	San Joaquin Delta Community College Shasta Community College	California State University, Stanislaus California State University, Chico
The Los Angeles Program	Los Angeles Unified School District	None	California State University, Dominguez Hills
The Merced Program	Merced City School District Atwater Elementary School District Livingston Union School District Planada Elementary School District Weaver Elementary School District Winton Elementary School District	Merced Community College	California State University, Stanislaus
The Oakland Program	Oakland Unified School District	Laney Community College	California State University, Hayward
The San Francisco Program	San Francisco Unified School District	San Francisco City College	San Francisco State University
The San Jose Program	San Jose Unified School District	San Jose City Community College	San Jose State University
The Stockton Program	Stockton Unified School District	San Joaquin Delta Community College	California State University, Stanislaus
The Ventura County Program	Hueneme School District Ventura Unified School District Oxnard Elementary School District Rio School District	Ventura Community College Oxnard Community College Moorpark Community College	California State University, Northridge (Ventura Campus)
TOTAL: 13	30	14	14

Data Table 4: Ethnicities of Current Participants and Program Graduates, and Data Table 5: Languages Other Than English Spoken by Current Participants and Program Graduates

One purpose of the California School Paraprofessional Teacher Training Program is to diversify the teaching profession. Information included in [Tables 4](#) and [5](#) (pp. 144-145) indicates that the program is serving a linguistically and culturally diverse population of current participants and has produced a linguistically and culturally diverse group of program graduates.

[Table 4](#) includes the ethnicities of the 577 program participants who responded to the fall 1998 survey question regarding their ethnicity. Of the participants who responded, 82% are members of ethnic minority groups. [Table 5](#) shows that 458 participants indicated they speak languages other than English. Some of these participants may speak more than one language and/or dialect.

179 program graduates responded to the survey question regarding their ethnicity. Of those, 73% are members of ethnic minority groups, and 170 of the program graduates are fully certified in the areas of bilingual education, special education, or both.

Overall, twenty-six percent (26%) of the 775 participants in the program have graduated from the program and are serving as certificated teachers.

Data Table 6: Academic Standing of Paraprofessional Program Participants (Fall 1997)

The primary purpose of the California School Paraprofessional Teacher Training Program is to create a career ladder that enables school paraprofessionals to become certificated classroom teachers. On page 146, [Table 6](#) shows that 460 of the 580 participants are currently enrolled in coursework at participating campuses of the California State University. This number represents 80% of all program participants. Of the 460 California State University enrollees, 174 are enrolled in teacher preparation programs, and the other 286 are enrolled in Bachelor's degree programs. Participants who are currently enrolled in teacher preparation programs can attain full certification within two years.

**Status Report Data Table 4:
Ethnicities of Current Participants and Program Graduates
(Data Source: 1998-99 Annual Reports)**

**Current Program Participants
As of Fall 1998**

Ethnicities	Numbers
African American	47
Armenian	9
Asian (Chinese, Korean and Japanese)	25
Filipino	6
Mexican American/Hispanic	304
Middle Eastern	5
Native American/American Indian	5
Pacific Islander	4
Southeast Asian (Hmong, Cambodian, Lao, Mien, and Vietnamese)	66
White Non-Hispanic	105
Other White	1
TOTAL:	577¹

¹Of the 580 program participants, 577 responded to the survey question regarding ethnicity.

**Program Graduates
As of Fall 1998**

Ethnicities	Numbers
African American	11
Armenian	17
Asian (Chinese, Korean and	21

Japanese)	
Filipino	4
East Indian	1
Mexican American/Hispanic	64
Native American/American Indian	0
Pacific Islander	0
Russian/Ukrainian	1
Southeast Asian (Hmong and Vietnamese)	26
White	49
Other White	1
TOTAL:	195

**Status Report Data Table 5:
Numbers of Current Participants and Program Graduates
Who Speak Languages Other than English
(Data Source: 1998-99 Annual Reports)**

Current Program Participants

Languages Other than English	Numbers
American Sign Language	1
Armenian	9
Cambodian	12
Chinese	22
Farsi	1
Filipino	6
French	3
German	1
Hebrew	1
Japanese	1
Korean	2
Pacific Islander	4
Punjabi	1
Southeast Asian (Hmong, Cambodian, Lao and Mien)	66
Spanish	312
Vietnamese	16
TOTAL:	458

Program Graduates

Languages Other than English Spoken	Numbers
Armenian	17
Chinese	21
Hmong	26
Korean	5
Punjabi/Hindi/Urdu	1

Russian/Ukrainian	1
Spanish	64
Vietnamese	1
TOTAL:	136

**Status Report Data Table 6:
Academic Standing of Paraprofessional Program
Participants (Fall 1998)**

(Data Source: 1998-99 Annual Reports)

Paraprofessional Program Participants		Academic Standing of Program Participants		
Program Sites	Total Numbers of Participants	Attending Community Colleges	Attending CSU Campus: Enrolled in B.A. Degree Programs	Attending CSU Campus: Enrolled in Credential Programs
Anaheim HSD	25	9	9	7
Azusa USD	30	0	13	17
Chula Vista ESD	27	8	15	4
Fresno/Clovis USD	42	0	23	19
Glendale USD	9	0	4	5
Lodi/Redding USD	39	21	10	8
Los Angeles USD	45	0	16	29
Merced City SD	77	28	41	8
Oakland USD	35	14	20	1
San Francisco USD	117	17	59	41
San Jose USD	24	1	22	1
Stockton USD	43	0	20	23
Ventura County	67	22	34	11
TOTALS:	580	120	286	174

Data Table 7: Numbers of Program Participants Seeking Special Education and Bilingual Education Certification

It was legislatively mandated that the Paraprofessional Teacher Training Program focus on recruiting teachers for bilingual education and special education. [Table 7](#) (page 148) shows that there are 451 paraprofessionals pursuing either special education or a bilingual education teaching credentials, or both. This number represents 78% of all program participants, and indicates that the program is achieving this significant educational purpose.

It should also be noted that an additional 122 participants are seeking a Crosscultural, Language and Academic Development (CLAD) authorization which authorizes English language development instruction for English language learners.

Data Table 8: California Basic Educational Skills Test (CBEST) Passage Data

In addition to completion of a teacher preparation program, the requirements for California teacher certification include passage of the California Basic Educational Skills Test, or CBEST. This test assesses each individual's basic skills in reading, writing and mathematics. However, many of the program participants view the exam as challenging, especially paraprofessionals who are not native speakers of English.

Many students who enroll in traditional teacher preparation programs are advised to take the CBEST no later than their junior year. Participants in the Paraprofessional Teacher Training Program are encouraged to take the test as soon as they complete a basic college course in mathematics. Participants are advised that taking the CBEST will relieve their anxiety about the exam and will allow them to determine what type(s) of tutorial support may be needed.

On pages 149-150 [Table 8](#) includes information about the numbers of program participants who had taken the CBEST prior to or during 1998-99, the numbers who had passed the entire test at that time, and the numbers of participants who had

passed one or more sections of the exam. Of the 580 participants, 329 had taken the CBEST in 1998-99 or earlier. This represented 57% of all participants. Of those who had taken the CBEST, 66% passed the entire three-part examination. This is a significant accomplishment since the majority of program participants are from language backgrounds that make the exam challenging. The other half of the program participants are (1) completing college courses in mathematics, reading and writing; (2) participating in supplementary workshops on test-taking skills; and (3) receiving accurate feedback about their skill levels when they take the CBEST examination.

**Status Report Data Table 7:
Numbers of Program Participants Seeking
Special Education and Bilingual Education Certification
(Data Source: 1998-99 Annual Reports)**

Paraprofessional Program Participants		Certification Goals			Grand Totals
Program Sites	Total Numbers of Participants	Bilingual Education Bilingual Crosscultural Language and Academic Development (BCLAD)	Special Education	Special Education with BCLAD Emphasis	Totals Seeking Bilingual and Special Education Authorizations
Anaheim HSD	25	13	12	0	25
Azusa USD	30	23	1	0	24
Chula Vista ESD	27	18	8	1	27
Fresno/Clovis USD	42	20	7	3	30
Glendale USD	9	4	0	0	4
Lodi/Redding Consortium	39	23	13	2	38
Los Angeles USD	45	41	1	1	43 ₁
Merced City SD	77	57	12	4	73
Oakland USD	35	20	4	3	27 ₂
San Francisco USD	117	41	34	4	79 ₃
San Jose USD	23	15	5	0	20
Stockton USD	43	33	5	0	38
Ventura Consortium	67	10	13	0	23
TOTALS:	580	318	115	18	451

**Status Report Data Table 8:
California Basic Educational Skills Test Passage Data
Current Program Participants
(Data Source: 1998-99 Annual Reports)**

Program Sites	Total Numbers of Participants	Numbers Of Participants Who Have Taken the Exam and Percent of Total Number of Participants	Numbers of Participants Who Have Passed the Entire CBEST Exam	Numbers of Participants Who Have Passed One or More Sections of the CBEST

					Exam
Anaheim High School District	25	12	48	9	2
Azusa Unified School District	30	30	100	23	6
Chula Vista Elementary School District	27	26	97	17	4
Clovis/Fresno Unified School Districts	42	30	72	22	7
Glendale Unified School District	9	6	67	6	0
Lodi/Redding Consortium	39	4	11	4	0
Los Angeles Unified School District	45	37	83	29	8
Merced Area Consortium	77	33	43	20	13
Oakland Unified School District	35	8	23	5	3
San Francisco Unified School District	117	72	62	28	12
San Jose Unified School District	24	16	67	9	3
Stockton Unified School District	43	23	54	20	3
Ventura Consortium	67	32	48	25	7
TOTALS:	580	329	57%	217	68

Data Table 9: Program Graduates and Current Program Participants Employed As Teachers

On the next page, [Table 9](#) shows how many program graduates and program participants are currently serving in California public school classrooms. All of the participants must continue to serve as part-time school paraprofessionals during their enrollment in the program. To remain in the program, they must also adhere to its academic standards, including completion of a minimum number of units per quarter/semester, and maintenance of a minimum grade point average. Most of the participants also have families, and many of them function as the heads of their households. Because of these employment, academic and personal requirements, almost all of the program participants are part-time students. Taking all of these factors into consideration for a participant who has finished little or no prior coursework, it will take as many as seven years of part-time study to earn a baccalaureate degree and complete a teacher education program. While the participants' status as part-time students extends their time in the program, it does not increase the program's overall costs, because as part-time students the participants are eligible to pay part-time college and university tuition fees.

At its inception in 1995, the total number of program participants was 566. Since then, the program has produced a total of 195 fully-certificated teachers for California's public schools. Of the current 580 paraprofessionals participating in the program, 85 are currently serving in classrooms on preliminary credentials (21 participants), internship credentials (27) and emergency permits (37). Until March 1999, the program proudly claimed a 100% retention rate. However, we have learned that one San Francisco graduate entered the United States Peace Corps and will serve in an instructional capacity while in service. This reduces the retention rate to 97% and brings to 279 the total number of program graduates and participants who are serving as teachers in California public schools. Still, these are impressive production and retention data for a program which began with few participants having advanced academic training and experience.

To evaluate the success and effectiveness of the Paraprofessional Teacher Training Program, its productivity should be viewed in light of fact that all of the participants must work and maintain families and households while they complete college and university casework to earn academic degrees and professional certification.

Data Table 10: Economic Status of Participants: Income Range Per Household

Among the questions included in each local program's annual survey was a request for information regarding the participants' economic status, which is required by law. [Table 10](#) on page 153 shows that 528 participants responded to this question. Of those responding, 48 percent identified their household income range as being between \$10,000 and \$20,000 in total annual income.

It should also be noted that 483 participants responded to questions asking if they are the head of the household and if they pay for their medical benefits. Of those respondents, 56 percent indicated they are heads of households, and 37 percent pay for their own medical coverage.

**Status Report Data Table 9:
Current Program Participants and
Program Graduates Who are Employed as Teachers
(Data Source: 1998-99 Annual Reports)**

Programs	Numbers of Current Participants Serving as Teachers of Record and Certification Held			Numbers of Program Graduates Serving as Teachers of Record	Grand Totals
Program Sites	Preliminary Credential	University Internship	Emergency Permit	Graduate Totals	Numbers Serving as Teachers of Record
Anaheim HSD	0	0	0	2	2
Azusa USD	0	10	7	0	17
Chula Vista ESD	0	0	2	0	2
Fresno/Clovis USD	10	5	2	45	62
Glendale USD	0	0	0	35	35
Lodi/Redding Consortium	3	0	2	5	10
Los Angeles USD	2	3	9	9	23
Merced City SD	0	2	0	15	17
Oakland USD	0	0	0	9	9
San Francisco USD	0	0	0	55 ¹	55
San Jose USD	0	0	1	0	1
Stockton USD	4	6	6	4	20
Ventura Consortium	2	1	8	15	26
TOTALS:	21	27	37	194	279

¹The graduate of the San Francisco program has recently entered the United States Peace Corps.

**Status Report Data Table 10:
Economic Status of Participants in Terms of
Income Range Per Household
(Data Source: 1998-99 Annual Reports)**

Program Sites	Total Numbers of Partici- pants	Under \$10,000	\$10,000 - \$20,000	\$20,000 - \$30,000	\$30,000 - \$40,000	\$40,000 - \$50,000	Over \$50,000	Total Numbers of Respon- ses

Anaheim HSD	25	0	4	8	2	1	2	17
Azusa USD	30	4	5	4	7	4	6	30
Chula Vista ESD	27	13	12	2	0	0	0	27
Clovis/Fresno USD	42	13	15	7	5	2	0	42
Glendale USD	9	2	2	4	0	1	0	9
Lodi/Redding Consortium	39	0	10	20	4	3	2	39
Los Angeles USD	45	0	22	0	23	0	0	45
Merced Consortium	77	23	24	12	8	2	3	72
Oakland USD	35	4	22	8	1	0	0	35
San Francisco USD	117	0	101	16	0	0	0	117
San Jose USD	24	4	14	5	0	0	0	23
Stockton USD	43	6	11	5	7	3	5	37
Ventura Consortium	67	7	11	8	4	5	0	35
TOTALS:	580	76	253	99	61	21	18	528

Data Table 11: Description of Selected Financial and Other Resources Made Available to the Program by Local Education Agencies and Institutions of Postsecondary Education, and Data Table 12: In-Kind Support Provided Per Year by Local Education Agencies and Postsecondary Institutions

The California School Paraprofessional Teacher Training Program is a unique program that provides opportunities for participants, who have varying levels of prior academic training, to attain full certification as classroom teachers. In addition to the financial support provided by the Commission through the form of program grants, additional support for program participants comes from three sources: local education agency support, postsecondary institution support and cohort support. In compliance with law, the Commission requires all programs to provide some in-kind support to foster the success of each program. The levels of in-kind support for the program vary from locality to locality. While some agencies have access to few resources for the program, many other sponsors of local programs provide extensive in-kind support to provide participants with additional incentives to complete the program. [Tables 11](#) and [12](#) on pages 156-161 demonstrate that substantial amounts of fiscal and other resources support participants in the program.

Data Table 13: California School Paraprofessional Teacher Training Program Support and Average Annual Cost Per Participant

On page 162, [Table 13](#) includes information on the amount each local program has invested in (a) tuition, books, other educational fees charged to the program participants, and (b) other services to participants. The Commission requires the cost of tuition, fees and books to comprise more than one-half of each local program's budget. As [Table 13](#) shows, more than three-quarters (76 percent) of the \$1.6 million in grant funds are used to cover these essential college costs.

[Table 13](#) also shows the total amount awarded to each program for the 12-month period from June 1998 through June 1999. From program to program, the actual annual cost per participant varies greatly, and depends on the following factors.

- (1) The numbers of participants who attend a community college, and the numbers who attend a California State University campus.
- (2) The numbers of participants who complete the program during the year.
- (3) The amounts of local resources that are invested as in-kind contributions to the program.
- (4) The availability of local resources to support program administrative costs, and the percentage of state funding that support these costs.
- (5) The percentages of each grant that are consumed by the indirect costs of local education agencies.

Based on the total amounts that were awarded to the programs, the average annual cost per participant is \$2802.

It is important to note that since not all of the local education agencies can provide extensive in-kind support and assume the operating costs of the program, the amounts invested for other services provided to participants must vary. The program is intended to provide opportunities for a diverse population of paraprofessionals to become fully-certificated teachers. To preclude program participation from local education agencies with little financial and other resources would deny program access to eligible paraprofessionals.

**Status Report Data Table 11:
Description of Selected Financial and Other Resources Made Available to Local Programs by
Local Education Agencies and Postsecondary Institutions
(Data Sources: 1998-99 Annual Reports and 1997 Site Visits)**

Program Sites	Descriptions of Resources
Anaheim Union High School District	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The District offers a \$2025.00 per year incentive for moving from Instructional Assistant to Instructional Associate on the Career Ladder. This amount is equivalent to a \$3.00 per hour increase, per participant.
Azusa Unified School District	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Career Ladder salary compensation is granted based upon course work completed. • Informal mentoring between participants and their respective teacher supervisors. • Participant use of a computer and a power book. • Facilities are provided for on-site college/university courses.
Chula Vista Elementary School District	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Paid release time for class attendance and cohort meeting attendance. • The Director of Human Resources presents workshops on interview techniques and certificated hiring practices. • Use of copy machines, Internet access, mail plus postage and staff development workshops.
Clovis/Fresno Unified School Districts	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Paid release time for class attendance and cohort meeting attendance. • California State University Fresno houses the program coordinator's office and provides a computer, telephone and desk for the coordinator's daily use. • California State University, Fresno provides facilities for cohort meetings, tutoring and California Basic Educational Skills Test (CBEST) preparation workshops.
Glendale Unified School District	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Paid release time for class attendance and cohort meeting attendance. • Professional Growth credit is granted for course work completed. • Yearly staff development and in-service workshops. • California State University Los Angeles and Loyola Marymount offer on-going consultation and technical assistance by university liberal studies advisors. • Program graduates are included in Beginning Teacher Support and Assessment (BTSA) Program. This support facilitates a smooth transition from the Paraprofessional Teacher Training Program into the teaching profession.
Lodi/Redding Consortium	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Career Ladder salary compensation is granted based upon course work completed. • A satellite campus of California State University,

	<p>Stanislaus is located nearby at the Multiple Campus Regional Center. This allows participants to complete approved course work off-site and locally instead of commuting to the main campus.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • San Joaquin Delta College provides facilities for cohort meetings and administrative team meetings. • The Director of Human Resources presents workshops on interview techniques and certificated hiring practices. • Yearly staff development and in-service workshops. • The program underwrites California Basic Educational Skills Test (CBEST) and Multiple Subjects Assessment for Teachers (MSAT) preparation workshops. • District staff provides in-service workshops on various instructional methodologies. • Program graduates are included in Beginning Teacher Support and Assessment Program. This support facilitates a smooth transition from the Paraprofessional Teacher Training Program into the teaching profession.
Los Angeles Unified School District	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The District has established an Outstanding Teacher Candidate Program and awards a \$3000.00 stipend to candidates selected by their schools. • Tuition reimbursement on the Career Ladder, based upon course work completed and completion of the performance assessment.
Merced Consortium	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Salary compensation based upon course work completed. • Paid release time for workshop attendance. • Three Merced City School District Teachers on Special Assignment donate time and provide in-service training in the areas of language arts and mathematics at monthly cohort workshops. • Teachers from consortium districts donate their time and expertise by assisting with administration of the program.
Oakland Unified School District	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A Human Resources Division employee administers the tuition and book cost billing process for all participants. • An additional Human Resources Division employee donates time to answer questions regarding certificated positions available within the district and district hiring practices.
San Francisco Unified School District	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The District grants a stipend equivalent to 2 hours per day for each participant. The total cost per year to the District is \$410,000. • Paraeducators have been identified as professionals. They work a minimum of 4 hours per day and receive medical, retirement and other benefits as provided for full-time employees. • The District provides a full-time program facilitator. • The program underwrites California Basic Educational Skills Test (CBEST) and Multiple Subjects Assessment for Teachers (MSAT) preparation workshops.
San Jose Unified School District	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Facilities are provided for evening college/university classes. • Salary compensation on the Career Ladder is based upon course work completed.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Bilingual Office presents a yearly course on early literacy and staff development workshops in literacy methodologies. • The District offers staff development sessions on classroom management, discipline and curriculum.
Stockton Unified School District	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • District staff provides in-service workshops on various instructional methodologies. • Office services support • Professional growth credit is granted for advancement on the Career Ladder. • A satellite campus of California State University Stanislaus is located nearby at the Multiple Campus Regional Center. This allows participants to complete approved course work off-site and locally instead of commuting to the main campus. • San Joaquin Delta College provides facilities for cohort and administrative team meetings.
Ventura Consortium	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Ventura County Office of Education has instituted a Teacher Support Program which links the Paraprofessional Teacher Training Program, California State University Northridge Internship Program and the Bilingual Teacher Recruitment Program and provides participants with additional academic support. • The District facilitator also provides academic advising and donates time as a Special Education academic advisor. • Consortium Districts offer negotiated stipends for program participants. • California State University, Northridge, Ventura Campus, provides facilities for California Basic Educational Skills Test (CBEST), Multiple Subjects Assessment for Teachers (MSAT) and Bilingual Crosscultural Language and Academic Development (BCLAD) preparation workshops. • Office services support is provided by District and California State University, Northridge, Ventura Campus.
Participating Campuses of the California Community Colleges and California State University	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All institutions of higher education offer the usual scholarships, grants and loans to eligible program participants.

**Status Report Data Table 12:
In-Kind Support to Program Participants Provided Per Year by
Local Education Agencies and Postsecondary Institutions
(Data Source: 1998-99 Annual Reports)**

Program Sites	Local Education Agencies			In-Kind Support Provided
	School Districts	Community Colleges	California State Universities	
Anaheim Union High School District	\$22,400	\$17,350	\$5,000	\$44,750
Azusa Unified School District	\$15,760	\$0	\$3,000	\$18,760
Chula Vista Elementary School District	\$40,913	\$0	\$0	\$40,913
Clovis/Fresno Unified School District	\$6,000	\$0	\$8,800	\$14,800

Glendale Unified School District	\$62,343	\$0	\$7,560	\$69,903
Lodi/Redding Consortium	\$15,600	\$3,000	\$3,000	\$21,600
Los Angeles Unified School District	\$29,652	\$0	\$11,300	\$40,952
Merced Consortium	\$156,850	\$3,600	\$4,800	\$165,250
Oakland Unified School District	\$7,602	\$0	\$0	\$7,602
San Francisco Unified School District	\$492,330	\$6,966	\$5,466.00	\$505,612 ¹
San Jose Unified School District	\$23,250	\$2,000	\$3,000	\$28,250
Stockton Unified School District	\$27,894	\$0	\$0	\$27,894
Ventura Consortium	\$36,192	\$2,575	\$8,000	\$47,267 ²
TOTALS:	\$936,786	\$35,491	\$59,926	\$1,033,553

¹ An additional \$850 of in-kind support services is provided by the United Educators of San Francisco Union. This brings the total in-kind support provided to San Francisco Unified School District participants to \$505,612.

² An additional \$500 of in-kind support services is provided by the California School Employees Association. This brings the total in-kind support provided to Ventura Consortium participants to \$47,267.

**Status Report Data Table 13:
California School Paraprofessional Teacher Training Program Support
and Average Annual Cost Per Participant
(Data Sources: 1998-99 Annual Reports)**

Program Sites	Total Numbers of Participants	Grant Amounts Invested for Tuition, Books and Other IHE Fees	Grant Amounts Invested for Other Services to Participants	Program Grant Awards: June 1998 Through June 1999
Anaheim Union High School District	25	\$51,200	\$16,637	\$67,837
Azusa Unified School District	30	\$82,433	\$20,525	\$102,958
Chula Vista Elementary School District	27	\$64,057	\$15,093	\$79,150
Clovis/Fresno Unified School Districts	42	\$99,163	\$75,182	\$174,345
Glendale Unified School District	9	\$22,554	\$9,072	\$31,626
Lodi/Redding Consortium	39	\$68,706	\$19,532	\$88,238
Los Angeles Unified School District	45	\$116,100	\$37,540	\$153,640
Merced Area Consortium	77	\$185,446	\$18,228	\$203,674
Oakland Unified School District	35	\$61,789	\$47,944	\$109,733
San Francisco Unified School	117	\$228,800	\$53,965	\$282,765

District				
San Jose Unified School District	24	\$67,620	\$32,452	\$100,072
Stockton Unified School District	43	\$101,121	\$22,800	\$123,921
Ventura Consortium	67	\$77,286	\$30,055	\$107,341
Totals:	580	\$1,226,275	\$399,025	\$1,625,300

TOTAL AVERAGE ANNUAL COST PER PARTICIPANT: \$2,802

Conclusions
California Teacher Supply And Demand and the
Degree to which the California School Paraprofessional
Teacher Training Program Can Meet the Teacher Demand If
Properly Funded and Executed
(Data Sources: California Basic Educational Data Systems,
***Where Have All the Teachers Gone?*, California Statewide**
Task Force on Teacher Recruitment,
1997-98 Credential Profile and 1999 Annual Reports)

Established by statute in 1990, the California School Paraprofessional Teacher Training Program is intended to address several key issues and opportunities in California's public schools, including: the shortage of teachers, the need to diversify the teaching profession, the potential to improve instructional services provided by school paraprofessionals and the opportunity to explore innovative models for teacher education. Because California has a linguistically and culturally diverse student population, there exists a shortage of fully and appropriately certificated bilingual teachers. Additionally, there is a shortage of fully certificated special education teachers. In an effort to address these shortages, follow-up legislation was passed in 1991 that required the program to focus on the recruitment of paraprofessionals to specialize in bilingual and special education. The statute called for the Commission to realize these goals by awarding grants, through a competitive process, to several school districts or county offices of education who would implement the program.

Funding for the program was included in the State Budget for the first time in 1994. The 1994-95 budget contained \$1.478 million in local assistance funds for implementation of the program, and a \$60,000 allocation to the Commission's budget to administer the program. State law mandates the participation of at least 12 local education agencies, a maximum of 600 school paraprofessionals, participation of several campuses of the California Community Colleges (CCC) and several campuses of the California State University (CSU). Currently, the program is comprised of a total of 13 project sites, 580 participants and includes the participation of 14 campuses of the CCC and 14 CSU campuses. The 13 projects have been fully operational since January 1995.

Over the next ten years California will need between 250,000-300,000 classroom teachers. Additionally, in 1996 California policymakers allocated \$771 million for a statewide reduction in class sizes for grades K-3, which increases the demand for elementary teachers. During the 1996-97 school year, the Commission issued 56,274 emergency teaching permits that authorized K-12 classroom teaching, instruction of English learners, special education instruction, and day-to-day substitute teaching. Many of the recipients of these permits had little or no teaching experience at the time the permits were issued.

During the 1997-98 school year, the Commission issued a grand total of 195,839 certification documents. The number of emergency permits issued for that year increased by 25% to a total of 74,680. This number represents 39% of all certification documents issued.

Of the total number of emergency permits issued in 1997-98, 22,625 were issued in the areas of elementary education, special education and bilingual education. The increase in the number of emergency permits issued in these areas demonstrates an ongoing need for fully-certificated elementary education, bilingual education and special education teachers.

It was legislatively mandated that the Paraprofessional Teacher Training Program focus on recruiting teachers for bilingual education and special education. Of the current 580 participants, 451 are seeking either special education or bilingual education teaching credentials, or both. This number represents 84% of the total number of program participants and demonstrates that the program is clearly achieving this significant educational purpose.

Since becoming fully operational, the California School Paraprofessional Teacher Training Program has produced a total of 195 fully-certificated teachers. Of the 195 graduates, 75% are members of ethnic minorities. One hundred fifty-five of these graduates completed programs and are fully-certified in bilingual education, special education, or both. This number represents 83% of all program graduates. An additional 85 program participants are currently serving on preliminary

teaching credentials, internship credentials and emergency permits. One program graduate is no longer serving in the public schools of California because that graduate has entered the United States Peace Corps. This brings to 279 the total number of paraprofessional graduates and participates who are serving as teachers of record in classrooms.

In addition to operating a California School Paraprofessional Teacher Training Program Project, two of the existing project sites, San Jose Unified School District and Los Angeles Unified School District, have other career ladder programs for paraeducator advancement. The San Jose Unified School District Career Ladder Program is federally funded and has a total of 10 participants. The Los Angeles Unified School District Career Ladder Program is modeled after the California School Paraprofessional Teacher Training Program, and has proven to be an extremely successful district effort. The program is funded by the District, currently has more than 4,000 participants and, since fall 1995, has produced more than 1000 teachers for service in the Los Angeles Unified School District.

In 1997, California policymakers approved Assembly Bill 352 and 353 (Scott, Wildman, et al.) Chapters 737 and 831, Statutes of 1997, mandated that as of January 1, 1998 the program must recruit candidates from among 24 school districts or county offices of education. No funding, however, was provided in 1997 to expand the program as required.

In January 1999, Governor Gray Davis identified the California School Paraprofessional Teacher Training Program as an important element of his education initiative, Enhancing Professional Quality. Because Governor Davis believes strongly in the value of paraeducators and supports the establishment of meaningful paraeducator career ladders which lead to both enhanced responsibilities for paraeducators and teacher certification, he is proposing a \$10 million dollar augmentation for the program. We expect this \$10 million dollar augmentation during the 1999-2000 fiscal year.

According to a California Basic Educational Data Systems (CBEDS) Report (1997), there is a total of 94,746, school paraprofessionals serving in California's public schools. This previously unrecognized, untapped resource of personnel, who provide valuable instructional services to public school students, could partially satisfy the significant shortage of teachers in the areas of elementary education, special education and bilingual education. With financial assistance from the state in the form of grants from the Commission, eligible local education agencies can tap into this resource of paraprofessionals and cultivate quality educators for California's public schools and, in turn, decrease the number of emergency permits issued.

In the existing pool of paraprofessionals, some may not be interested in becoming teachers. Additionally, not all paraprofessionals and local education agencies will qualify for participation in the program. However, many other paraprofessionals are determined to become teachers, and may qualify for participation in the program. With the proposed \$10 million dollar augmentation, the Commission could invite current projects to submit proposals to expand their numbers, and could invite other local education agencies to submit proposals for new projects. Taking into consideration the focus of the program, the number of successful graduates from the program, their areas of certification and the impact the number of program graduates have made to satisfy local employer needs, full funding and operation of the program could make a significant impact on teacher shortages in the areas of elementary education, special education and bilingual education beginning in 1999-2000.



| [Back to the Top](#) |
| [Back to July 1999 Agenda](#)
|
| [Return to "Agenda Archives"](#) |
| [Return to "About CTC"](#) |





California Commission on Teacher Credentialing

Meeting of: July 7-8, 1999

Agenda Item Number: C&CA-1

Committee: Credentials and Certificated Assignments

Title: Proposed Regulations Related to Reading Instruction Competence Assessment

✓ Action

Prepared by: Yvonne Novelli, Program Analyst
Certification, Assignment and Waivers Division

Proposed Addition of Title 5 Regulation, §80071.5 Pertaining to the RICA

June 18, 1999

Summary

The following proposes to add Title 5 Regulation §80071.5, which pertains to individuals required to verify completion of the Reading Instruction Competence Assessment (RICA) requirement. This addition will delineate those individuals who are required to pass RICA before they may obtain the Multiple Subject Teaching Credential or, effective January 1, 2000, the Education Specialist Instruction Credential. Portions of the proposal are contingent upon the passage of Assembly Bill 466 (Mazzoni), which is sponsored by the Commission.

Fiscal Impact Statement

There will be a minor short-term cost to the agency related to holding a public hearing if the recommendation is adopted.

Policy Issues to Be Resolved

Shall the Commission delineate who is required to pass RICA before obtaining the Multiple Subject Teaching Credential or, effective January 1, 2000, the Education Specialist Instruction Credential?

Staff Recommendation

Staff recommends that the Commission approve the following addition of Title 5 Regulation, §80071.5, for the purposes of beginning the rulemaking file for submission to the Office of Administrative Law and the scheduling of a public hearing.

Background

Assembly Bill 1178 (Cunneen), Chaptered September 26, 1996 (Chapter 919), which became effective on January 1, 1997, amended Education Code 44283 to state that "first time credential applicants who are not credentialed in any other state" and are seeking a Multiple Subject Teaching Credential are required to pass the RICA. Since the passage of this bill, the Commission staff has interpreted this to mean the following:

1. "First time credential applicants" are individuals who do not hold a teaching credential based on both a baccalaureate degree and a teacher education program including student teaching, and
2. Individuals "credentialed in any other state" are individuals who hold a valid elementary teaching credential issued by another state.

Assembly Bill 2748 (Mazzoni), Chaptered August 17, 1998 (Chapter 303), which became effective on January 1, 1999, added Education Code 44283.2, which requires individuals seeking the Education Specialist Instruction Credential, January 1, 2000 and after, to pass the RICA. It does exclude applicants for the Early Childhood Special Education Certificate from this requirement.

The current Assembly Bill 466 (Mazzoni), if approved through the Legislature and signed by the Governor, will establish the following amendments to the Multiple Subject Teaching and Education Specialist Instruction Credentials with respect to the RICA.

Multiple Subject Teaching Credential:

1. The proposal will defer the RICA requirement for the two-year preliminary Multiple Subject Teaching credential for out-of-state trained individuals until they request the three-year extension.

Education Specialist Instruction Credential:

1. The bill will exempt applicants for the Early Childhood Special Education Credential from the RICA requirement.
2. The proposal will create a two-year preliminary Level I Education Specialist Instruction Credential for out-of-state trained special education teachers that will defer the RICA requirement until the three-year extension.
3. The bill will add a comparable "first time credential applicants who are not credentialed in any other state" statement as that found in the Multiple Subject statutes.

This was presented at the June 1999 Commission Meeting as an information item. Based on comments regarding last month's item, subsections (a), (b), and (g) have been removed and the information regarding the effective dates of the RICA requirement is more clearly stated in the introductory paragraph. The current §80071.5(b) now clarifies the renewal requirement for out-of-state trained individuals, and §80071.5(c) has been modified to close a loop-hole.

Proposed Addition of §80071.5

The following is a detailed discussion of the proposed §80071.5 subsections. These specify the Multiple Subject and Education Specialist Instruction Credential applicants who are exempt from the RICA. Those exemptions affected by AB466 are italicized. Because many of the exemptions are contingent upon the passage of AB466, staff will not be able to begin the rulemaking process until after the bill is signed by the Governor.

Introductory Paragraph

The introductory paragraph establishes that the RICA requirement is only needed for those individuals who apply for the Multiple Subject Teaching Credential on or after October 1, 1998 and the Education Specialist Instruction Credential on or after January 1, 2000

§80071.5(a)

This subsection refers to the RICA exemptions found in Education Code 44283.2(b), currently the Early Childhood Special Education Certificate. *If AB466 becomes law, Education Code 44283.2(b) will also exempt individuals seeking the Early Childhood Special Education Credential.*

§80071.5(b)

The proposed amendments to Education Code 44253, found in AB466, will allow out-of-state individuals seeking a two-year preliminary Multiple Subject Teaching Credential or an Education Specialist Instruction Credential to defer verifying the RICA requirement. The CBEST education code, §44252(b)(3), also allows the issuance of the one-year nonrenewable credential without verifying the RICA requirement. The proposed §80071.5(b) reflects these exemptions. Additionally, it clarifies that to renew the two-year preliminary, the individual must pass RICA unless exempt by either of the two following subsections.

§80071.5(c)

Education Code 44283.2 exempts individuals who are not "first time credential applicants" from the RICA requirement when applying for the Multiple Subject Teaching Credential. *AB466 will also allow the same exemption for Education Specialist Instruction Credential applicants.* This

subsection clarifies that the exemption refers to individuals who hold a valid California teaching credential based on a baccalaureate degree and a teacher education program including student teaching, such as the Single Subject or Standard Elementary Teaching Credentials. *It also clarifies that individuals who received a two-year preliminary Multiple Subject Teaching Credential or an Education Specialist Instruction Credential, based on §80071.5(b), are not exempt from the RICA requirement if they apply for the three-year extension while holding only the valid two-year preliminary. Additionally, a modification made since the June meeting clarifies that the holders of the one-year nonrenewable credentials, based on §80071.5(b), are not exempt from the RICA, thus closing an unintentional loop-hole.*

§80071.5(d)

This proposed subsection reflects the RICA exemption, found in Education Code 44283, for individuals "credentialed in any other state" and seeking the Multiple Subject Teaching Credential and, *in AB466, the Education Specialist Instruction Credential*. The wording clarifies that the out-of-state credential must be valid and comparable to the California credential sought.

Proposed Regulations

Because of the numerous changes to the proposed regulations submitted in June, a copy of the current proposal and one noting the changes are included for easier reviewing.

Current Proposal **Section 80071.5, Pertaining to the RICA**

§80071.5. Reading Instruction Competence Assessment

Every applicant for an initial Multiple Subject Teaching Credential on or after October 1, 1998, or an initial Education Specialist Instruction Credential on or after January 1, 2000, shall be required to obtain a passing score on the Reading Instruction Competence Assessment (RICA) with the following exceptions.

- (a) Applicants applying for a document exempt by Education Code 44283.2(b).
- (b) Applicants applying for a one-year nonrenewable or a two-year preliminary teaching credential based on 1) a teacher education program including student teaching obtained outside of California and 2) a baccalaureate degree. These applicants must pass RICA prior to renewing the two-year preliminary unless exempt by §80071.5 (c) or (d).
- (c) Applicants holding a valid California teaching credential, other than the credentials described in (b), based on a baccalaureate degree and a teacher education program including student teaching.
- (d) Applicants holding a valid teaching credential from another state, with a comparable authorization to the credential sought.

NOTE: Authority cited: Section 44225(q), Education Code. Reference: Sections 44253, 44283 and 44283.2 Education Code.

Proposal Noting the Changes

Section 80071.5, Pertaining to the RICA

Strike-throughs and **bold underlines** and indicate changes made since the June Commission Meeting.

§80071.5. Reading Instruction Competence Assessment

Every applicant for an initial Multiple Subject Teaching Credential **on or after October 1, 1998**, or an **initial** Education Specialist Instruction Credential **on or after January 1, 2000**, shall be required to obtain a passing score on the Reading Instruction Competence Assessment (RICA) with the following exceptions.

- (a) Applicants renewing a one-year nonrenewable, preliminary, clear or professional clear Multiple Subject Teaching Credential initially issued prior to October 1, 1998.
- (b) Applicants renewing 1) a preliminary Level I or professional clear Level II Education Specialist Instruction Credential initially issued prior to January 1, 2000.
- (c) Applicants applying for a document exempt by Education Code 44283.2(b).
- (a)
- (d) Applicants applying for a one-year nonrenewable or a two-year preliminary teaching

- (b) credential based on 1) a teacher education program including student teaching obtained outside of California and 2) a baccalaureate degree. **These applicants must pass RICA prior to renewing the two-year preliminary unless exempt by §80071.5 (c) or (d).**
- (e) Applicants holding a valid California teaching credential, other than the two-year
- (c) preliminary credentials described in (d) **(b)**, based on a baccalaureate degree and a teacher education program including student teaching.
- (f) Applicants holding a valid teaching credential from another state, with a comparable
- (d) authorization to the credential sought.
- (g) Applicants applying for an initial preliminary Level I or professional clear Level II Education Specialist Instruction Credential prior to January 1, 2000.

NOTE: Authority cited: Section 44225(q), Education Code. Reference: Sections 44253, 44283 and 44283.2 Education Code.



| [Back to the Top](#) |
| [Back to July 1999 Agenda](#)
|
| [Return to "Agenda Archives"](#) |
| [Return to "About CTC"](#) |





California Commission on Teacher Credentialing

Meeting of: July 7-8, 1999

Agenda Item Number: C&CA-2

Committee: Credentials and Certificated Assignments

Title: Revision of Renewal Process for Professional Clear Credentials

✓ Report

Prepared by: Dale Janssen, Manager
Certification, Assignment and Waivers Division

Revision of Renewal Process for Professional Clear Credentials

June 23, 1999

Summary

In accordance with Goal Three of the Commission's strategic plan, "Improve customer service provided by the Commission", the Certification, Assignment and Waivers Division (CAW) has been reviewing its procedures in an effort to reduce paperwork and streamline the processing of credentials. One area that provides an opportunity for savings of paperwork and credential processing time is the renewal of professional clear credentials. This report outlines a method for professional clear credential holders to renew their credentials through an applicant self-verification process.

Fiscal Impact

There is an added expense in initial staff time to develop a self-verification procedure, but this will be offset by the reduced amount of time required to process a professional clear renewal.

Background

On April 16 senior management and CAW staff met with a stakeholders focus group to review certification policies and procedures and to make recommendations to improve these policies and procedures. This group consisted of representatives from the Credential Counselors and Analysts of California, the California State University System, county personnel administrators, small colleges, large and small school districts and large and small county offices of education. This group recommended 22 changes to the certification process. One of these recommendations is to institute a self-verification process to renew professional clear credentials. The other recommendations are strictly procedural and staff is currently implementing them.

The holder of a professional clear credential, except designated subjects, must complete 150 hours of professional growth that must be approved and verified by a professional growth advisor. The holder must also complete 90 days of professional service verified by an employer. To renew the credential, the holder submits a form that lists the professional growth activities and includes a signature by both the credential holder and the professional growth advisor verifying that the activities meet the requirements in statute and regulation. The holder also submits a form verifying 90 days of service signed by an employer. The certification staff does not review the professional growth activity form to determine if the activities are valid since that is the role of the professional growth advisor, nor does the staff verify the authenticity of the professional growth advisors signature. The same holds true for the verification of the 90 days of professional service which is the responsibility of the employer.

After reviewing the professional clear renewal process, staff concurred with the stakeholder's recommendation to allow renewal through self-verification. It does not appear to be necessary for the applicant to submit the two forms mentioned above. If the Commission were to eliminate the need for these forms, there would be a reduction in the paper that is handled by our cashing, certification, and quality control units. It would also

eliminate the need for the Commission to pay to have these forms shredded since they contain private information. This self-verification process would not eliminate the professional clear credential holder from completing the required activities; it eliminates the holder from submitting these forms to the Commission for review.

Self-Verification Process

A self-verification process requires the credential holder to verify on the application form and under penalty of perjury that he or she has completed the necessary requirements to renew a professional clear credential. The applicant will also be required to list his or her professional growth advisor.

To alleviate the concern that teachers will not complete the professional growth requirements, staff will audit a percentage of the professional clear renewals. This audit would require the credential holder to submit the completed Professional Growth Plan and Record Form and a signed verification of professional service. The State Medical Board and the State Bar Association use this type of self-verification and audit process for the renewal of doctor's and attorney's licenses.

Savings

The Commission processed approximately 44,000 professional clear credentials during the 1997-98 fiscal year. By eliminating the need for the submission of the professional growth activities form and the professional service form, staff estimates that it will save approximately 1,466 hours per year to the Division. This is time that will be allocated to answering phones and responding to e-mail. This new process will also allow for these renewals to be eventually processed on the Commission's web page.

Staff anticipates instituting the self-verification process for professional clear credential holders by September 1 with web renewal anticipated sometime in early 2000.



| [Back to the Top](#) |
| [Back to July 1999 Agenda](#)
| [Return to "Agenda Archives"](#) |
| [Return to "About CTC"](#) |





California Commission on Teacher Credentialing

Meeting of: July 7-8, 1999

Agenda Item Number: C&CA-3

Committee: Credentials and Certificated Assignments

Title: Proposed Amendments to Title 5 Section 80001 Related to Definitions of Critical Terms

✓ Information

Prepared by: Yvonne Novelli, Program Analyst
Certification, Assignment and Waivers Division

Proposed Amendments Title 5 Regulation, §80001 Pertaining to Definitions and Terms

June 23, 1999

Summary

The following proposes to amend Title 5 Regulation §80001 related to definitions and terms. The proposal revises the currently listed definitions and adds the definitions for a number of new terms.

Fiscal Impact Statement

There will be a minor cost to the agency related to holding a public hearing if the recommendation is adopted, but there is no long-term fiscal impact.

Policy Issues to Be Resolved

Shall the Commission revise the definitions found in §80001?

Background

Section 80001 defines the terms used through out the Commission's division of the Title 5 Regulations. It plays a major role in correctly implementing the regulations that govern the Commission's responsibilities, and it adds consistency to the discussions between the Commission and its shareholders. This regulation was last revised in 1983.

Proposed Amendments to §80001

In this information item, for easier reviewing, the current definitions in §80001 are listed first. The second group includes the new terms defined and the last, the forms defined. The definitions and terms pertain to all sections in Division VIII, yet allow for flexibility so any specific law or regulation may supersede them.

Current Terms and Definitions

Most of the amendments to the definitions of these terms only add clarity. The amendments that do create significant changes are to the terms found in subsection (e), (f) and (k).

- In subsection (e), the term used to denote all certification issued by the Commission has been changed from "credential" to "document" because credential is only one type of available certification, and it is used in many regulations as a method to exclude permits and waivers. An example of this is the special education credential requirement for a preliminary Resource Specialist Certificate. If credential is defined as all documents, then someone with a waiver or emergency permit in a special education area could qualify for this.

- In subsection (f), "degree" includes the associate degree because of one of the minimum requirements for the Child Development Site Supervisor Permit. "Baccalaureate Degree" is defined in the new terms.
- Subsection (k) has been deleted because the definition of "profession" is found in the proposed "clear or professional" terms.

80001. Definitions and Terms

The following definitions and terms are for purposes of Part Division VIII of the Title 5 California Code of Regulations, unless the term is redefined for a specific condition in a specific statute or regulation:

- (a) "Applicant" means any applicant individual applying for a credential document issued by the Commission
- (b) "Application for a credential" includes an application for a credential, an application for a renewal of a credential, an application to add new authorizations to an existing credential, or is a request to take any special action in relation to the issuance of a credential document issued by the Commission.
- (c) "Chairman Chairperson" means the Chairman of the Commission pursuant to Education Code Section 44218.
- (d) "Commission" means the Commission on Teacher Credentialing as defined in Education Code Section 44203(a) and as constituted established under pursuant to Education Code Section 44210.
- (e) "Credential Document" means any credential, life diploma, permit, certificate, or waiver or document issued by, or under the jurisdiction of, the Commission which entitles the holder thereof to perform services for which certification qualifications are required.
- (f) "Degree" means an baccalaureate associate or higher degree as specified in Education Code Section 44259(a) earned through an approved college or university a regionally accredited institution of higher education. , regardless of its title, when the degree program contains no less subject matter preparation than a similar degree in a subject field other than professional education in the same institution.
- (g) "Denial" includes the denial of either 1) all of an application for a document or 2) any portion of an application for a credential document even though the requested credential document is issued or renewed.
- (h) "Executive Secretary Director" means the Executive Secretary Director to the Commission pursuant to Education Code Section 44220.
- (i) "Issuance" means the granting of a credential document based upon completing the requirements and applying application for or renewal of that credential the document.
- (j) "Vice-Chairman Vice-Chairperson" means the Vice-Chairman Vice-Chairperson to of the Commission.
- (k) "Professional" credential means a credential for which all statutory and regulatory requirements have been met, excluding credentials issued on partial, preliminary, or emergency bases. A "clear" credential means a professional credential as herein defined.

NOTE: Authority cited: Section 44225(q), Education Code. Reference: Section 44267.5 44225, Education Code. (Filed 7-25-83; effective thirtieth day thereafter; Register 83, No. 30).

New Terms and Definitions

In this proposal, the following definitions are added to §80001. They are terms commonly used by the field and the Commission yet either do not appear in regulations or appear only in sections related to specific certification issues. Including these in the general definition section would not only allow for easy access to the definitions but also ensure continuity when using the terms.

1. "Baccalaureate Degree" means a baccalaureate degree awarded by an institution of postsecondary education and that meets the criteria established by a regional accrediting body recognized by the Council on Postsecondary Accreditation and the United States Department of Education
2. "Certificate of Eligibility" is a document issued when all document requirements have been met except the current-employment requirement. *(Note: At this time, Certificates of Eligibility are available for the Education Specialist Instruction Credentials and the Administrative Services Credentials.)*
3. "Clear or professional" document means a teaching or service document issued with

no further academic requirements, including professional growth and experience, needed for renewal.

4. "Committee on Accreditation" means the twelve-member standing committee appointed by the Commission that has the responsibility of determining whether professional preparation institutions and programs meet the standards for initial and continuing accreditation that have been adopted by the Commission.
5. "Departmentalized Classroom" is one in which the teacher is assigned to instruct a group of students in a specific subject-matter area.
6. "Emphasis" means an area of specialization that is listed on a Multiple Subject or Single Subject Teaching Credential based on completion of a specialized program. Emphasis programs include, but are not limited to, Crosscultural, Language and Academic Development (CLAD), Bilingual Crosscultural, Language and Academic Development (BCLAD), Early Childhood Education, and Middle School.
7. "Employer" is the entity that contracts with or otherwise engages a holder or applicant for the performance of educational services.
8. "Employing Agency" means a California public school district; county office of education; non-public, nonsectarian school or agency; state or federal agency; charter school; or private schools of equivalent status.
9. "Employment restriction" means a restriction placed on a document that limits employment to the employing agency that requested the document.
10. "Expiration date" means the last date the document is valid.
11. "Full-time experience" means serving a minimum of 4 hours a day, unless the minimum statutory attendance requirement for the student served is less. Experience must be on a daily basis and for at least 75% of the school year. Experience may be accrued in increments of a minimum of one semester. An individual may not be credited with more than one year from any school year.
12. "Grade of C or better" in an A through F grading pattern includes grades "Pass", "Credit", and "Satisfactory".
13. "Issue date" and "issuance date" mean the beginning validity date listed on a document.
14. "Life documents" are documents that were issued for the life of the holder, unless otherwise revoked, and do not require renewal.
15. "Non-public, nonsectarian school or agency" means a private school or agency granted non-public school or agency status by the California Department of Education.
16. "Non-remedial coursework" or "college-level coursework" for other than child development permits means coursework taken at a regionally accredited institution of higher education and applicable towards a baccalaureate or higher degree. "Non-remedial coursework" or "college-level coursework" for the child development permits means coursework taken at a regionally accredited institution of higher education and applicable towards an associate or higher degree.
17. "Private schools of equivalent status" are schools determined by the California Department of Education to be comparable to the public schools; serve pupils of the same age group as the public schools; follow a secular curriculum; follow a public school time schedule; and serve a diverse group of students.
18. "Professional growth" means the activities that contribute to a document holder's competence, performance or effectiveness in the profession of education.
19. "Professional preparation program" means either a set of courses including supervised field experience, or an equivalent alternative program, that provide a curriculum of systematic preparation for serving as an educator in California public schools (preschool, K-12, and programs for adults).
20. One "quarter unit" equals two-thirds of a semester unit.
21. "Regionally accredited institution of higher education" means an institution of postsecondary education accredited by a regional accrediting body recognized by the Council on Postsecondary Accreditation and the United States Department of Education. In California the regional accrediting body is the Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC).
22. "School year" means a minimum of 175 days of service unless otherwise defined by the school district.
23. "Self-Contained Classroom" is one in which all, or most, subjects are taught to one group of students by a single teacher.

24. "Term of a document" means the period of validity of the document.

Forms

The forms are included so they may be more easily referenced in the other sections of the regulations. These forms are used by applicants and may be found in most districts, county offices of education, and institutions of higher education. The revision dates will be added after the regulations are approved by Office of Administrative Law.

1. *Application for Character and Identification Clearance* (form 41-CIC, rev XX/XX) is the form that must be submitted when professional fitness clearance is required.
2. *Application for Credential Authorizing Public School Service* (form 41-4 rev. XX/XX) is the form used to request the issuance of a document other than the Certificate of Clearance, waivers, replacements, duplicates, and name changes.
3. *Declaration of Change of Name* (form CL-541, rev. XX/XX) is the form used to request the change of the document holder's name on a document.
4. *Request for Duplicate or Replacement Document* (form CL-566, rev.XX/XX) is the form used to request a duplicate or replacement of a document.
5. *Variable Term Waiver Request* (form WV1, rev. XX/XX) is the form used to request the waiver of any requirements for a document.





California Commission on Teacher Credentialing

Meeting of: July 7-8, 1999

Agenda Item Number: PERF-1

Committee: Performance Standards

Title: Proposed Schedule for Examination Validity Studies

✓ Action

Prepared by: Bob Carlson, Ph.D., Administrator
Professional Services Division

Summary of an Agenda Report

Proposed Schedule for Examination Validity Studies

**Professional Services Division
June 23, 1999**

Overview of this Report

In 1997, the Commission completed a strategic planning process and adopted strategic goals, with related objectives and strategic plans, including the following:

- Initiate and complete periodic studies of the validity of all examinations and assessments, and make needed changes.

In July 1997, the Commission approved a proposed Budget Change Proposal (BCP), which was subsequently approved by the Department of Finance, the Legislature, and the Governor, to provide spending authority for the implementation of the strategic plan. When the Commission approved the proposed BCP in July 1997, it also accepted the staff recommendation that a validity study of each credential examination occur every five years based on a schedule that would be adopted by the Commission. This report:

- describes the need for periodic validity studies of the Commission's credential exams,
- describes the elements of the periodic validity studies,
- proposes a schedule for examination validity studies over the next four years, and
- discusses the costs of the periodic validity studies.

Relationship to the Commission's Strategic Goals and Objectives

Goal One: To promote educational excellence in California schools.

Objective One: Develop candidate and program standards.

Objective Two: Develop and administer teacher assessments.

Policy Issue to be Resolved

Should the Commission adopt a four-year schedule for validity studies of all teacher credentialing examinations used by the Commission?

Fiscal Impact Statement

The costs for the proposed contractor-conducted validity studies of large-volume examinations can be funded from the Commission's Test Development and Administration Account (408) reserve, pending approval of **spending authority being sought via legislation and a Budget Change Proposal (BCP), as described in this report**. The costs for the proposed staff-conducted validity studies of low-volume examinations are covered within the base budget of the Professional Services Division pursuant to a previously approved BCP.

Recommendations

- (1) That the Commission adopt the **proposed schedule for examination validity studies** presented in this report.
- (2) That the Commission authorize the Executive Director to release a Request for Proposals for a validity study of the CBEST.

Background

In 1997, the Commission completed a strategic planning process and adopted five strategic goals including *Strategic Goal One: Promote Educational Excellence in California Schools*. Shortly after drafting its strategic goals, the Commission developed four objectives related to Goal One, including *Objective 1-B: Develop and Administer Teacher Assessments*. Later, the Commission adopted the following two strategic plans for achieving Objective 1-B:

- Initiate and complete periodic studies of the validity of all examinations and assessments, and make needed changes.
- For all examination programs, monitor performance and report aggregated results (for populations of examinees).

The subject of this report is a proposed schedule related to the *first* strategic plan for accomplishing Objective 1-B: periodic validity studies.¹ In July 1997, the Commission approved a proposed Budget Change Proposal (BCP) to provide spending authority for the implementation of the two strategic plans listed above for achieving Objective 1-B. The BCP, discussed in more detail beginning on page 12, was subsequently approved by the Department of Finance, the Legislature, and the Governor.

¹In February 1999, staff presented and the Commission adopted a proposed schedule related to the second strategic plan. Pursuant to that schedule, staff began presenting annual reports to the Commission in March 1999.

When the Commission approved the proposed BCP in July 1997, it also accepted the staff recommendation that a validity study of each credential examination occur every five years. In its July 1997 report to the Commission, staff provided a general description, summarized below, of how these validity studies could be accomplished.

- (1) The Commission would begin by establishing a schedule for the validation studies. The schedule would separate the exams into two categories: high-volume exams that are taken by the largest numbers of candidates, and low-volume exams that fewer candidates take. The schedule would be an annual schedule in which several exams would be reviewed each year. (A proposed schedule is included in this report.)
- (2) To examine the validity of high-volume examinations, the Commission annually would award a contract (based on competitive bids) to external experts who specialize in evaluating the validity of standardized examinations. Each contract would call for a validity study of one or more high-volume exams. The scope and methodology of the study would be commensurate with the large volume of candidates who take the particular exam(s) being reviewed. The sequence of validity studies would be in accordance with the schedule adopted by the Commission.
- (3) To examine the validity of low-volume examinations, the Commission would establish a staff position for one specialist in this field of educational measurement. The responsibilities of the professional in this position would be to plan, design, conduct, analyze, and report the findings of validity studies of several low-volume exams each year, according to the schedule adopted by the Commission. (This position has been established and recently filled.)

This report:

- describes the need for periodic validity studies of the Commission's credential exams,
- describes the elements of the periodic validity studies,
- proposes a schedule for examination validity studies over the next four years, and
- discusses the costs of the periodic validity studies.

The Need for Periodic Validity Studies

The need for periodic validity studies of its credential examinations is directly related to one of the Commission's most fundamental missions: to provide a strong assurance that teaching credentials are awarded to individuals who have learned the most important knowledge, skills, and abilities that are actually needed in order to succeed in California public school teaching positions. The validity of each credential examination used by the Commission has been established in conjunction

with the initial development of each exam. Professional practice and legal defensibility require, however, that the validity of the exams be periodically reinvestigated, as job requirements and expectations may change over time.

If the Commission maintains the validity of its credential examinations, then these examinations will fulfill the valuable public mission of protecting K-12 students from teachers whose knowledge, skills, and abilities are insufficient and substandard. If the Commission does not do so, the examinations will have very limited utility as devices for screening the knowledge, skills, and abilities of credential applicants. In fact, it would be harmful for the Commission to allow its examinations to assess knowledge, skills, and abilities that are not important or job-related. Such examinations would lead to (a) the award of teaching credentials to some individuals who are not qualified to teach, and (b) the denial of teaching credentials to some other individuals who are qualified to teach.

Significant and related purposes of periodic validity studies are to substantially (a) reduce the likelihood of litigation related to credential exams and (b) increase the probability of prevailing in such litigation.

Requirements and Implications of Federal Law

The California Basic Educational Skills Test (CBEST) was recently the subject of a landmark decision by the United States District Court. In this lawsuit (AMAE, et al. vs. CCTC), plaintiffs urged the Court to require that the Commission discontinue administering the basic skills test because (a) the test had an "adverse impact" on the plaintiffs, and (b) the Commission had not established the content validity or job-relatedness of the examination. The following implications can clearly be drawn from the Commission's own legal defense of the credential examination, and the Court's decision, which accepted the Commission's arguments about the exam.

- (1) According to the United States District Court, federal employment law requires that the Commission periodically establish strong evidence for the content validity of each examination that credential candidates need to pass in order to be eligible for educational credentials and positions in California public schools.
- (2) In Court, the Commission's defense of the CBEST was extensive and comprehensive, and included legal arguments by a prominent law firm. The "core" of the Commission's case, however, was a set of interrelated validity studies that were initiated by the Commission in 1994 (after the lawsuit was filed) and completed in 1995 (before the case came to trial). These included (a) a job analysis that investigated the work requirements of positions for which candidates take the CBEST and apply for credentials, (b) a study that examined the extent to which the CBEST specifications and test questions were aligned with the job requirements, and (c) standard-setting studies that examined how well minimally-competent applicants would score on the CBEST. The single most important reason why the Commission prevailed in Court was the fact that the Commission-sponsored validity studies were objective, intensive investigations that withstood the scrutiny of the Court and its Expert Consultant. These studies affirmed the CBEST's validity for a limited period of time, however, not indefinitely.

Prior to the Court's resolution of the CBEST lawsuit, federal requirements were vague with regard to the use of standardized examinations as requirements for occupational or professional certification. The Commission's own defense of the CBEST and the resulting Court decision served to clarify these requirements. If the Court's decision withstands a pending appeal, it will confirm that the Commission (and other occupational licensing agencies) can use standardized examinations as certification requirements only if they periodically assemble evidence for the content validity of the examinations, and for the passing standards on those examinations. Because this resolution was established by the United States District Court, it has the nationwide effect of a federal law.

Requirements and Implications of State Law

In addition to the federal requirements as stipulated in the recent CBEST Court decision, the Commission is also required to comply with the following provisions of the California Education Code that relate to specific credential examinations.

California Basic Educational Skills Test (CBEST)

For the CBEST, Assembly Bill 27X (Leach), signed by Governor Davis on April 12, 1999, requires the Commission to "review the state basic skills proficiency test to evaluate the test's content validity, reliability, and passing scores," and "submit a written report pertaining to the review of the test, including any findings and recommendations, to the Legislature, the Governor, and the State Board of Education on or before January 1, 2001."

The Multiple Subjects Assessment for Teachers (MSAT) and the Praxis and Single Subject Assessments for Teaching (SSAT) Subject Matter Examinations

Recent law (SB 2042) stipulates that "the Commission shall ensure that subject matter standards and examinations are aligned with the state content and performance standards adopted for pupils." Such standards have recently been adopted by the State Board of Education. It is through the process of the validity studies described in this report that the Commission can (a) determine the extent to which the MSAT and other subject matter exams are aligned with the new student standards and (b) modify the exams as necessary to ensure alignment.

Reading Instruction Competence Assessment (RICA)

For the RICA, Education Code Section 44283 requires that the Commission "initially and periodically analyze the validity and reliability of the content of the assessment," and "establish and implement appropriate passing scores on the assessment."

Education Code Section 44253.5 (c) mandates that "the scope and content of the [CLAD/BCLAD] examinations shall consist of the professional skills and knowledge that are determined by the Commission to be necessary for effective teaching of limited-English-proficient pupils."

In addition, the Commission is currently seeking amendments to Assembly Bill 1059 (Ducheny) that, if eventually approved by the Legislature and signed by the Governor, would require the Commission to "review the content validity of the [CLAD/BCLAD] examinations . . . in relation to the knowledge, skills, and abilities needed to foster the academic success of English language learners in learning English and achieving grade-level proficiency in the core curriculum." This bill has passed out of the Assembly and is now being considered by the Senate.

Elements of the Periodic Validity Studies

The major elements of the proposed periodic validity studies of each credentialing examination used by the Commission are as follows:

- (1) **Job Analysis.** The first element would be a job analysis focusing on the job requirements associated with the domain of knowledge and skills assessed on the examination of interest. For example, for the Praxis and SSAT exams in English, the job analysis would identify the English subject matter tasks, knowledge, and abilities needed by teachers who teach English in departmentalized classrooms with a Single Subject Teaching Credential in English. Job analyses typically involve (a) developing an inventory of potential tasks, knowledge, and abilities needed on the job based on interviews and/or observations with job incumbents, literature reviews (e.g., student content standards), and input from expert panels; (b) surveying job incumbents for their judgments of the importance on the job of the tasks, knowledge, and abilities in the inventory, and the extent to which beginning teachers should be able to perform the task or have the knowledge or ability; and (c) analyzing the survey results. Staff would present the results of the job analysis to the Commission in a written report.
- (2) **Review and Potential Revision of the Current Test Specifications.** The results of the job analysis would be used by an expert panel and Commission staff to review and potentially revise the current test specifications. The test specifications would describe, in a more integrated manner than the job analysis inventory, the tasks, knowledge, and abilities that are important for beginning teachers to know and be able to do.
- (3) **Validity Study of the Test Specifications.** The third element of the proposed periodic validity studies of each credentialing examination used by the Commission would be a validity study of the test specifications, which may or may not have been revised on the basis of the job analysis. This would involve (a) surveying job incumbents for their judgments of the importance for beginning teachers of the tasks, knowledge, and abilities represented in the test specifications; and (b) analyzing the survey results.
- (4) **Finalization and Adoption of the Test Specifications.** The results of the validity study of the test specifications would be used by an expert panel and Commission staff to make necessary revisions to the test specifications. The specifications would then be presented to the Commission for their consideration and adoption with a report describing the methodology and results of the validity study of the specifications. Upon Commission adoption, the specifications would become final.
- (5) **Review of Test Questions in Relation to Test Specifications.** Following adoption of the test specifications by the Commission, the next step would be to review the extant test questions for their congruence with the specifications. This may be accomplished by having groups of job incumbents review the items in relation to the specifications. If the specifications are only slightly changed or not changed at all, few or no test questions would be expected to be inconsistent with the specifications. On the other hand, if the new specifications differ significantly from the earlier version, a substantial number of test questions would be expected to be inconsistent with the new specifications. The next step would depend on the extent to which the specifications have changed. Commission staff would submit a report to the Commission with specific advice about the future development of new exam questions that will be valid in relation to the new specifications.
- (6) **Standard Setting Study.** The final element in the proposed periodic validity studies of each credentialing examination used by the Commission would be a standard setting study. This step should occur regardless of whether or not the test specifications or test questions were changed. For examinations that have been changed, and that have adequate numbers of examinees, the standard setting study would occur following the initial administration of the revised test so that examinee performance data could be considered in the standard setting study. The results of the study would be used to determine if the Commission should change the passing standard on the exam. The results of the standard-setting study, with staff recommendations, would be presented in a written report to the Commission.

Staff expects that the above six elements would be included in the proposed periodic validity studies of both the high-volume examinations, conducted with the assistance of an external contractor, and the low-volume examinations, conducted by Commission staff. The details related to the extent of effort is likely to differ, however, for the two categories of examinations. For example, the sample sizes for the job analysis surveys are likely to be larger for the high-volume exams than for the low-volume exams.

Proposed Schedule for Examination Validity Studies

Table 1 on the next page is a proposed schedule over the next four years for validity studies of all of the credential examinations currently used by the Commission. For each of the four years the schedule shows the examinations that would be reviewed. The top row of the schedule shows the high-volume exams for which the Commission would contract validity reviews. The bottom row shows the low-volume exams for which Commission staff would conduct validity studies.

The validity studies would be initiated in the year shown, but may not be completed in the same year. The final element of the studies, a standard setting study, would take place following any necessary development, and possibly administration, of new test questions and test forms. Contractors would be secured through the standard state competitive bidding process. Prior to releasing each Request for Proposals (RFP), staff would seek the Commission's approval, as it is now seeking approval for the release of an RFP for a validity study of the CBEST (discussed below).

Table 1: Proposed Schedule for Examination Validity Studies

1999-2000	2000-2001	2001-2002	2002-2003
Conducted by Contractor	Conducted by Contractor	Conducted by Contractor	Conducted by Contractor
MSAT <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Content Knowledge Examination Content Area Exercises CBEST <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reading Writing Mathematics 	Praxis and SSAT Exams in English, the Sciences, and Social Science <ul style="list-style-type: none"> SSAT Literature and English Language Praxis English Language, Literature and Composition: Essays SSAT Biology Praxis Biology: Content Essays SSAT Chemistry Praxis Chemistry: Content Essays SSAT Geoscience SSAT Physics Examination Praxis Physics: Content Essays SSAT General Science Praxis General Science: Content Essays SSAT Social Science Praxis Social Studies: Analytical Essays Praxis Social Studies: Interpretation of Materials 	CLAD/BCLAD Examinations <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Test 1: Language Structure and Language Development Test 2: Methodology of Bilingual, English Language Development, and Content Instruction Test 3: Culture and Cultural Diversity Test 4: Methodology for Primary-Language Instruction Test 5: Culture of Emphasis (Armenian, Chinese, Filipino, Hmong, Khmer, Korean, Latino, Punjabi, Vietnamese) Test 6: Language of Emphasis (Armenian, Cantonese, Filipino, Hmong, Khmer, Korean, Mandarin, Punjabi, Spanish, Vietnamese) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Listening -Speaking -Reading -Writing 	RICA <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Written Examination Video Performance Assessment
Conducted by CCTC Staff	Conducted by CCTC Staff	Conducted by CCTC Staff	Conducted by CCTC Staff
Praxis and SSAT Exams in Mathematics and Physical Education <ul style="list-style-type: none"> SSAT Mathematics Praxis Mathematics: Proofs, Models, and Problems, Part 1 and Part 2 SSAT Physical Education Praxis Physical Education: Movement Forms&endash;Analysis and Design Praxis Physical Education: Movement Forms&endash;Video Evaluation 	Praxis and SSAT Exams in Art and Music <ul style="list-style-type: none"> SSAT Art Praxis Art: Content, Traditions, Criticisms, and Aesthetics Praxis Art Making SSAT Music Praxis Music: Analysis Praxis Music: Concepts and Processes 	Praxis and SSAT Exams in Languages Other Than English <ul style="list-style-type: none"> SSAT French Praxis French: Linguistic, Literary and Cultural Analysis Praxis French: Productive Language SSAT Spanish Praxis Spanish: Linguistic, Literary and Cultural Analysis Praxis Spanish: Productive Language SSAT German SSAT Japanese SSAT Korean SSAT Mandarin SSAT Punjabi SSAT Russian SSAT Vietnamese 	SSAT Exams in Vocational Education Subjects <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Agriculture Business Health Science Home Economics Industrial and Technology Education

The proposed schedule in [Table 1](#) is contingent upon increased spending authority. This issue is discussed in the final section of this report.

Validity Studies in 1999-2000

MSAT

The validity study of the MSAT is currently underway pursuant to a contract with WestEd approved by the Commission in June 1999.

CBEST

As described above, a recent law (AB 27X, Leach), signed by Governor Davis on April 12, 1999, requires the Commission to conduct a validity study of the CBEST and submit a written report of the results to the Legislature, the Governor, and the State Board of Education on or before January 1, 2001. To meet the legislated completion date, it is critical that the Executive Director release an RFP as soon as possible. Staff proposes the schedule shown in Table 2 below for the required CBEST validation study.

Table 2: Schedule for CBEST Validity Study

1999	
July 8	Commission authorizes Executive Director to release RFP
July 23	RFP released
September 6	Proposal due date
September 6-17	Proposals evaluated
October 7	Commission authorizes Executive Director to enter into a contract with sponsor of highest quality proposal
October - December	Job analysis
2000	
January - March	Review and potential revision of the current specifications in light of job analysis results
April - June	Validity study of the test specifications
July - September	Finalization and adoption of the test specifications
September - October	Review of test questions in relation to test specifications
November - December	Preparation of report

Praxis and SSAT Examinations in Mathematics and Physical Education

The schedule in Table 1 shows that Commission staff would initiate in 1999-2000 validity studies of the Praxis and SSAT examinations in mathematics and physical education. Commission staff have already begun planning these studies.

Discussion of the Proposed Schedule

The proposed schedule of examination validity studies in Table 1 is an ambitious plan that is contingent upon increased spending authority, discussed below. Because this is a new plan for critical work that requires substantial resources and represents a significant workload, the proposed schedule should be reevaluated in a year or two. Having implemented both contractor-conducted and staff-conducted validity studies, at that time staff will have a better understanding of the costs, workload, and a variety of other issues related to the validity studies. Some modification to the schedule might be warranted at that time.

Once all of the exams in Table 1 have been reviewed, the cycle would start over again, with the goal that every examination is reviewed every five to six years. In the next schedule we may want to initiate validity studies of the MSAT and the CBEST in two separate years to even out the workload. At some point, we would need to add the teaching performance assessment (pursuant to SB 2042) to the cycle.

A significant implication of the planned validity studies is the potential that the studies would indicate the need for new test development. The extent and costs of the needed development cannot be predicted at this time, but would almost certainly require additional resources. Test modifications are likely to be easier to accomplish with Commission-owned examinations (CBEST, RICA, CLAD/BCLAD, SSAT) than with contractor-owned examinations (MSAT, Praxis).

Estimated Costs of the Validity Studies

In July 1997, the Commission approved a proposed Budget Change Proposal (BCP) that would provide spending authority

for the implementation of the two strategic plans listed above for achieving Objective 1-B. The BCP was subsequently approved by the Department of Finance, the Legislature, and the Governor. The result was a permanent augmentation in the Commission's annual budget beginning in fiscal year 1998-99. For the purpose of completing periodic studies of the validity of all examinations, the BCP increased the Commission's annual budget by (a) \$250,000 for validity studies of high-volume examinations by contractors and (b) sufficient funds to support one Consultant in Examinations and Research and expert panel expenses for validity studies of low-volume examinations.

The BCP described above authorized the Commission to spend only \$250,000 per year for validity studies of high-volume examinations by contractors. Based on recent competitive bidding processes related to the MSAT and RICA, it is now clear that each validity study of a high-volume examination by an external contractor, including the six elements described above, will cost approximately \$600,000. For the contractor-conducted studies of the Praxis and SSAT exams in English, the sciences, and social science (scheduled for 2000-2001), the cost could be in the neighborhood of twice that much because of the large number of examinations covering three different subject areas. In this month's Commission agenda, staff is presenting for Commission consideration a BCP concept to increase the Commission's spending authority, beginning in 2000-01, for validity studies of high-volume examinations by contractors. (See FPPC-2). In addition, as directed by the Commission, staff is seeking additional spending authority for 1999-00 through the legislative process in order to complete the validity study of the MSAT (currently underway) and the validity study of the CBEST required by AB 27X. The plan proposed in this report is contingent upon the increased spending authority sought in the BCP and legislation.



- | [Back to the Top](#) |
- | [Back to July 1999 Agenda](#)
- | [Return to "Agenda Archives"](#) |
- | [Return to "About CTC"](#) |





California Commission on Teacher Credentialing

Meeting of: July 7-8, 1999

Agenda Item Number: PERF-2

Committee: Performance Standards

Title: Draft Annual Report on the Praxis and SSAT Exams in Art, Music, and Physical Education: December 1995 - June 1998

✓ Action

Prepared by: Bethany Brunsman, Ph.D, Consultant
Professional Services Division

Summary of an Agenda Report

Draft Annual Report on the Praxis and SSAT Exams in Art, Music, and Physical Education: December 1995 - June 1998

Professional Services Division
June 18, 1999

Overview of this Report

The Commission has a responsibility to periodically assemble, interpret, and publish the results of the examinations it uses to verify the qualifications of prospective educators.

The draft report entitled *Annual Report on the Praxis and SSAT Examinations in Art, Music, and Physical Education: December 1995 - June 1998*, that follows this agenda report (as Attachment to PERF -2), is the first of what will be annual reports describing the participation and performance of examinees on the Praxis and SSAT examinations used to verify subject matter knowledge in art, music, and physical education. The report provides information about the Praxis and SSAT exams and their development, administration, and scoring; presents preparation and demographic data about examinees who took the Praxis and SSAT exams in art, music, and physical education from December 1995 through June 1998; and provides information about examinee performance (i.e., passing rates) on the exams.

Relationship to the Commission's Strategic Goals and Objectives

Goal One: To promote educational excellence in California schools.

Objective One: Develop candidate and program standards.

Objective Two: Develop and administer teacher assessments.

Fiscal Impact Statement

The costs of preparing the report are supported from the agency's base budget.

Recommendation

Staff recommends that the Commission accept the draft report entitled *Annual Report on the Praxis and SSAT Examinations in Art, Music, and Physical Education: December 1995 --June 1998* and authorize staff to finalize it and make it available to interested parties.

Background

The Commission issues Single Subject Teaching Credentials that authorize the teaching of specific subjects in departmentalized classrooms, typically found in secondary schools. One of the requirements to earn a Single Subject Teaching Credential is verification of subject matter competence. To meet the subject matter requirement in art, music, or physical education, candidates must demonstrate subject matter knowledge in one of two alternative ways: (a) completion of a Commission-approved program of subject matter preparation for teaching in the subject area, or (b) passage of subject matter examinations. California Education Code Section 44281 requires the Commission to administer subject matter examinations and assessments for the purpose of assuring minimum levels of subject matter knowledge for teachers who take the exams in lieu of completing approved subject matter programs.

Since December 1995, the Commission has used selected exams in *The Praxis Series: Professional Assessments for Beginning Teachers* (Praxis exams), administered by Educational Testing Service (ETS), and the *Single Subject Assessments for Teaching* (SSAT exams), administered by National Evaluation Systems, Inc. (NES), for this purpose. The specific exams used to verify subject matter knowledge in art, music, and physical education are shown in the table on the next page. Candidates for Single Subject Teaching Credentials in art, music, and physical education who have not completed Commission-approved subject matter preparation programs must pass the appropriate Praxis and SSAT exams listed in the table.

The Commission has a responsibility to periodically assemble, interpret, and publish the results of the examinations it uses to verify the qualifications of prospective educators. Such reports enable the Commissioners and their diverse constituents to ascertain the effectiveness of the examinations and their impact on the overall system of teacher preparation in California. The publishing of reports on examination results is a public service strongly related to the Commission's function as the education licensing body in California.

Subject Matter Examinations in Art, Music, and Physical Education

Subject	Praxis Exam(s)	SSAT Exam
Art	Art Making Art: Content, Traditions, Criticism & Aesthetics	Art
Music	Music: Concepts & Processes Music Analysis	Music
Physical Education	Physical Education: Movement Forms - Analysis & Design Physical Education: Movement Forms - Video Evaluation	Physical Education

The draft report entitled *Annual Report on the Praxis and SSAT Examinations in Art, Music, and Physical Education: December 1995 - June 1998* that follows this agenda report (as Attachment to PERF-2) is the first of what will be annual reports describing the participation and performance of examinees on the Praxis and SSAT examinations used to verify subject matter knowledge in art, music, and physical education. This report provides information about the Praxis and SSAT exams and their development, administration, and scoring; presents preparation and demographic data about examinees who took the Praxis and SSAT exams in art, music, and physical education from December 1995 through June 1998; and provides information about examinee performance (i.e., passing rates) on the exams.

Staff recommends that the Commission accept the draft report and authorize staff to finalize it and make it available to interested parties.

[Click here for Table of Contents](#)

DRAFT

Annual Report on the Praxis and SSAT Examinations in Art, Music, and Physical Education December 1995 - June 1998



**Sacramento, California
June 1999**

DRAFT

Annual Report on the Praxis and SSAT Examinations in Art, Music, and Physical Education

December 1995 - June 1998

Author:

Bethany A. Brunsman, Ph.D., Consultant
Professional Services Division



Robert E. Carlson, Jr., Ph.D., Administrator
Professional Services Division

Dennis Tierney, Ph.D., Director
Professional Services Division

Sacramento, California

California Commission on Teacher Credentialing

June 1999

Members of the Commission

Torrie L. Norton, Chairperson	Teacher
Gary Reed, Vice Chairperson	Public Representative
Melodie Blowers	School Board Member
Verna B. Dauterive	Administrator
Carolyn L. Ellner	Faculty Member

Scott Harvey	Public Representative
Carol Katzman	Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction
Helen Lee	Public Representative
Doris Miner	School Counselor
Edmund Sutro	Teacher
Jane Veneman	Teacher
Nancy Zarenda	Teacher

Ex-Officio Members

Edward DeRoche	Association of Independent California Colleges and Universities
Elizabeth Graybill	California Postsecondary Education Commission
Jon Snyder	Regents, University of California
Bill Wilson	California State University

Executive Officer

Sam W. Swofford, Ed.D.	Executive Director
------------------------	--------------------

Table of Contents

List of Tables

Acknowledgments

Executive Summary

Summary of Preparation and Demographic Data for Examinees

Summary of Passing Rates on the Examinations

Part 1: Background Information

Part 2: Description, Development, Administration, and Scoring of the Examinations

Description of the Exams

Development of the Exams

Administration of the Exams

Scoring of the Exams

Part 3: Preparation and Demographic Data for Examinees and Passing Rates on the Examinations

Description of the Preparation and Demographic Data (Tables 5, 9, and 13)

Description of the Passing Rate Data (Tables 6-8, 10-12, and 14-16)

The Art Examinations

The Music Examinations

The Physical Education Examinations

Summary

Appendices (NOTE: Large file...Please allow sufficient time for downloading.)

- A: Praxis Examination Test Specifications
- B: SSAT Examination Test Specifications
- C: Praxis Examination Scoring Scales
- D: Sample Praxis and SSAT Individual Score Reports

List of Tables

- Table 1:** Subject Matter Examinations in Art, Music, and Physical Education
- Table 2:** Number of Candidates Who Earned Single Subject Teaching Credentials and How They Satisfied the Subject Matter Requirement, 1995-96 to 1997-98
- Table 3:** Number of Examinations Administered in 1997-98
- Table 4:** Exam Passing Standards in Art, Music, and Physical Education
- Table 5:** Preparation and Demographic Data for Art Exam Participants
- Table 6:** Cumulative Passing Rates on the Praxis and SSAT Art Exams (Combined)
- Table 7:** First-Time Passing Rates on the Praxis and SSAT Art Exams (Combined)
- Table 8:** Cumulative and First-Time Passing Rates on the Praxis and SSAT Art Exams (By Test)
- Table 9:** Preparation and Demographic Data for Music Exam Participants
- Table 10:** Cumulative Passing Rates on the Praxis and SSAT Music Exams (Combined)
- Table 11:** First-Time Passing Rates on the Praxis and SSAT Music Exams (Combined)
- Table 12:** Cumulative and First-Time Passing Rates on the Praxis and SSAT Music Exams (By Test)
- Table 13:** Preparation and Demographic Data for Physical Education Exam Participants
- Table 14:** Cumulative Passing Rates on the Praxis and SSAT Physical Education Exams (Combined)
- Table 15:** First-Time Passing Rates on the Praxis and SSAT Physical Education Exams (Combined)
- Table 16:** Cumulative and First-Time Passing Rates on the Praxis and SSAT Physical Education Exams (By Test)
- Table 17:** Summary of Passing Rates on the Praxis and SSAT Exams in Art, Music, and Physical Education

Acknowledgments

The author recognizes and appreciates the significant contributions of Commission staff members Diane Tanaka and Judy Oster in analyzing the data and assisting in producing the data tables for this report.

DRAFT

Annual Report on the Praxis and SSAT Examinations in Art, Music, and Physical Education December 1995 - June 1998

Executive Summary

The California Commission on Teacher Credentialing issues Single Subject Teaching Credentials that authorize the teaching of specific subjects in departmentalized classrooms, typically found in secondary schools. One of the requirements for earning a Single Subject Teaching Credential is verification of subject matter competence. Prospective teachers have two alternative ways to meet this requirement: (a) completion of a Commission-approved college or university program of subject matter preparation for teaching in the subject area, or (b) passage of subject matter examinations. California Education Code Section 44281 requires the Commission to administer subject matter examinations and assessments for the purpose of assuring minimum levels of subject matter knowledge for teachers who take the exams in lieu of completing approved subject matter programs.

Since December 1995, the Commission has used selected exams in *The Praxis Series: Professional Assessments for Beginning Teachers* (Praxis exams), administered by Educational Testing Service (ETS), and the *Single Subject Assessments for Teaching* (SSAT exams), administered by National Evaluation Systems, Inc. (NES), for this purpose. This report is the first of what will be annual reports describing the participation and performance of examinees on the Praxis and SSAT examinations used to verify subject matter knowledge in the subject areas of art, music, and physical education. The specific exams used are shown on the next page. Candidates for Single Subject Teaching Credentials in art, music, and physical education who have not completed Commission-approved subject matter preparation programs must pass the appropriate Praxis *and* SSAT exams listed.

This report provides information about the Praxis and SSAT exams and their development, administration, and scoring; presents preparation and demographic data about examinees who took the Praxis and SSAT exams in art, music, and physical education from December 1995 through June 1998; and provides information about examinee performance (i.e., passing rates) on the exams. Data are provided for three annual cohorts of participants. For each subject area, each participant is assigned to a cohort based on the year the participant initially took either a Praxis or an SSAT exam for that

subject area. For example, if a participant took the Praxis "Art Making" exam for the first time in 1995-96, and took "Art: Content, Traditions, Criticism, and Aesthetics" and the SSAT art exam for the first time in 1996-97, that participant was assigned to the 1995-96 cohort. Each participant is assigned to only one annual cohort.

Subject Matter Examinations in Art, Music, and Physical Education

Subject	Praxis Exam(s)	SSAT Exam
Art	Art Making	Art
	Art: Content, Traditions, Criticism & Aesthetics	
Music	Music: Concepts & Processes	Music
	Music Analysis	
Physical Education	Physical Education: Movement Forms - Analysis & Design	Physical Education
	Physical Education: Movement Forms - Video Evaluation	

Summary of Preparation and Demographic Data for Examinees

More candidates for Single Subject Teaching Credentials take the physical education exams than take the art or music exams. Fewer candidates take the Praxis exams than take the SSAT exams across subject areas.

At least half of each group had a Bachelor's Degree or a Bachelor's Degree plus additional units, and between 10 and 25 percent had a Master's Degree or above. The participants in the art and music exams appeared better prepared than the physical education examinees. Among the art and music participants, half or more had completed 37 or more semester units in the subject area, and 13% completed less than 25 units. In contrast, 40 percent of physical education examinees reported completing less than 25 units. The percent of reported undergraduate majors in the subject area of the exams ranged from 30% in physical education to 40% in art. The largest group of reported undergraduate GPAs was 2.5 - 3.49.

Although there is a substantial amount of missing information on this variable, it appears that perhaps the majority of each group was prepared in California. In art, the majority of participants were female; the reverse is true in physical education. Almost equal numbers of males and females took the music exams. All three groups consisted predominantly (77-80%) of White participants.

Summary of Passing Rates on the Examinations

The table below provides a summary of the cumulative and first-time passing rates on the Praxis and SSAT examinations in art, music, and physical education. *To fully understand this table and the discussion that follows, the reader should read "Description of the Passing Rate Data" below.*

Summary of Passing Rates on the Praxis and SSAT Exams
in Art, Music, and Physical Education

	Cumulative Passing Rates					
	All Participants		Attempted All Exams		First-Time Passing Rates	
	N	% Passed	N	% Passed	N	% Passed
Art	195	16.4	118	27.1	164	16.5
Music	127	29.1	96	38.5	152	16.4
Physical Education	524	19.5	353	28.9	509	9.8

IMPORTANT NOTE: See "Description of the Passing Rate Data".

Because the examinations are an alternative to the completion of a Commission-approved subject matter program at a college or university, candidates who are the most prepared do not take the exams. The passing rates on the exams should be interpreted with this in mind.

Candidates for music credentials were more successful at meeting the combined examination requirement than candidates for art or physical education credentials, in terms of cumulative passing rates. Art and music were similar in terms of first-time passing rates. The comparatively low first-time passing rates on the physical education exams may be due to the fact that the physical education examinees seem to be the least prepared. Candidates may be more likely to take the physical education exams to attempt to add an authorization for which they are unprepared to another credential than are music or art examinees.

The cumulative passing rates for participants who took all three exams are higher than the cumulative passing rates for all participants. This is due to the fact that not all participants took all required exams. It appears that some candidates who do not pass the first exam they take decide not to take other exams in that field.

On each separate exam, cumulative passing rates are higher than first-time passing rates, indicating that candidates who persist after an initial failure can improve. A comparison of the passing rates of annual cohorts of participants in the earlier data tables shows that in art, the cumulative passing rate of all participants, the cumulative passing rate of the participants who attempted all three required exams, and the first-time passing rate on the exams combined have increased. There are mixed results in music, where the cumulative passing rates have decreased, but the first-time passing rates on the exams combined have increased. In physical education, all three types of passing rates have decreased.

In art and music, females have higher overall cumulative passing rates than males. Passing rates for males and females on the physical education exams are almost equivalent. White participants have achieved higher passing rates than the other combined other ethnic groups have attained.

Although the relationship is somewhat mixed, preparation is generally related to performance on the art, music, and physical education exams. With the exception of physical education, participants with undergraduate majors in the subject areas have higher passing rates than participants who do not. Higher grade point averages are associated with higher passing rates in all three subject areas. Educational level is also positively related to passing rates. The data related to semester units of coursework are less definitive. In art and physical education, candidates with 25-36 semester units in the subject area have higher passing rates than did candidates with 37 or more semester units. These results may be attributed to the self-report nature of the data. Examinees may not remember or report accurately the number of units they have completed in the subject area. Coursework in a particular subject area may also not match up with the content measured on the exam. For example, in music, taking many units of ensemble may not prepare candidates to pass the exam.

DRAFT

Annual Report
on the Praxis and SSAT Examinations in
Art, Music, and Physical Education
December 1995 - June 1998

Part 1

Background Information

The California Commission on Teacher Credentialing issues Single Subject Teaching Credentials that authorize the teaching of specific subjects in departmentalized classrooms, typically found in secondary schools. One of the requirements for earning a Single Subject Teaching Credential is verification of subject matter competence. Prospective teachers have two alternative ways to meet this requirement: (a) completion of a Commission-approved college or university program of subject matter preparation for teaching in the subject area, or (b) passage of subject matter exams. California Education Code Section 44281 requires the Commission to administer subject matter examinations and assessments for the purpose of assuring minimum levels of subject matter knowledge for teachers who take the exams in lieu of completing approved subject matter programs.

Since December 1995, the Commission has used selected exams in *The Praxis Series: Professional Assessments for Beginning Teachers* (Praxis exams), administered by Educational Testing Service (ETS), and the *Single Subject Assessments for Teaching* (SSAT exams), administered by National Evaluation Systems, Inc. (NES), for this purpose. This report is the first of what will be annual reports describing the participation and performance of examinees on the Praxis and SSAT examinations used to verify subject matter knowledge in the subject areas of art, music, and physical education. The specific exams used are shown in [Table 1](#) on the next page. Candidates for Single Subject Teaching Credentials in art, music, and physical education who have not completed Commission-approved subject matter preparation programs must pass the appropriate Praxis *and* SSAT exams listed in Table 1.

[Table 2](#) shows the number of candidates who earned Single Subject Teaching Credentials from 1995-96 through 1997-98 in art, music, and physical education. The table also shows (a) the number of candidates who satisfied the subject matter requirement by completing Commission-approved subject matter preparation programs, and (b) the number and percentage of candidates who satisfied the subject matter requirement by passing the examinations. Most candidates for Single Subject Teaching Credentials in art, music, and physical education satisfy the subject matter requirement by completing subject

matter preparation programs.

Table 1: Subject Matter Examinations in Art, Music, and Physical Education

Subject	Praxis Exam(s)	SSAT Exam
Art	Art Making Art: Content, Traditions, Criticism, and Aesthetics	Art
Music	Music: Concepts & Processes Music Analysis	Music
Physical Education	Physical Education: Movement Forms - Analysis & Design Physical Education: Movement Forms - Video Evaluation	Physical Education

Table 2: Number of Candidates Who Earned Single Subject Teaching Credentials and How They Satisfied the Subject Matter Requirement, 1995-96 to 1997-98

Subject Area	Total Number of Teachers Credentialed*	Number Who Satisfied Subject Matter Requirement by Program	Number Who Satisfied Subject Matter Requirement by Exams	Percent Who Satisfied Subject Matter Requirement by Exams
Art	298	270	28	9%
Music	446	431	15	3%
Physical Education	590	560	30	5%

*Includes only "first time" and "new type" credentials. First time credentials are awarded to candidates who have not held credentials before. New type credentials add new authorizations to previous credentials.

Part 2 of this report provides information about the Praxis and SSAT exams and their development, administration, and scoring. Part 3 presents preparation and demographic data about examinees who began taking the Praxis and SSAT exams in art, music, and physical education between December 1995 and June 1998, and provides information about examinee performance (i.e., passing rates) on the exams.

Part 2

Description, Development, Administration, and Scoring of the Examinations

This part of the report includes a description of the Praxis and SSAT exams and provides information about their development, administration, and scoring.

Description of the Exams

The Praxis Exams

The Praxis exams in art, music, and physical education were developed to measure an examinee's depth of knowledge and higher-order thinking skills in a particular subject area through the use of constructed-response questions. The Praxis exams are based on content specifications that were developed by committees of California educators and teacher educators and adopted by the Commission. The test specifications for the Praxis exams in art, music, and physical education are provided in Appendix A. Each of the tests is described below. Examinees receive one hour to complete each exam.

Art

The Praxis exam "Art Making" consists of four constructed-response questions. Two questions assess knowledge of basic art making procedures. Examinees may be asked to describe the general steps, stages, or techniques associated with media or processes or to apply knowledge of basic art concepts, skills, or techniques of one medium or process to another medium or process. The other two questions, which are more heavily weighted, measure examinees' ability to create

artworks and reflect upon their work, the artistic concepts underlying their work, and the creative process involved in producing their work. Examinees are asked to bring four photographs or color reproductions of their own work from at least two different media and respond to questions about two works from different media.

"Art: Content, Traditions, Criticism, and Aesthetics" consists of three constructed-response questions. One question assesses the ability to discuss the content and purposes of particular artworks, including architecture. A second question requires examinees to recognize and discuss the historical context of artworks. The third question measures the ability to apply knowledge of art criticism and aesthetics in relation to specific artworks. The three questions are equally weighted.

Music

"Music: Concepts and Processes" includes two essay questions. One question offers a choice between an essay related to instrumental or choral performance techniques. Examinees are asked to describe correct performance techniques or remedial techniques for a specified performance problem. The second question deals with the ability to plan and describe a demonstration of a music concept. The two questions are equally weighted.

The Praxis exam "Music: Analysis" consists of two listening exercises and one essay. The listening exercises are critiques of an instrumental and a choral audiotaped performance. Examinees are asked to identify errors in technical interpretation (e.g., articulation, dynamics, balance). The essay measures the examinees' ability to evaluate the appropriate difficulty level; note important stylistic influences; and analyze instrumental, choral, and/or general music scores for important music concepts and/or performance problems. The listening exercises and the essay are weighted equally.

Physical Education

"Physical Education: Movement Forms -- Analysis and Design" contains two constructed-response questions, which present examinees with common situations in physical education. The questions may cover the topics of fundamental movements, movement forms, and/or fitness. The two questions are equally weighted.

"Physical Education: Movement Forms -- Video Evaluation" consists of two constructed-response questions. Examinees view videotaped segments of two minutes or less and respond to questions related to fitness; fundamental movements; or individual, dual, or team sports. The two questions are weighted equally.

The SSAT Exams

The SSAT exams in art, music, and physical education consist of 80 scorable multiple-choice items.¹ Like the Praxis exams, the SSAT exams are based on content specifications that were developed by committees of California educators and teacher educators and adopted by the Commission. The test specifications for the SSAT exams in art, music, and physical education are provided in Appendix B. Each exam was designed to measure an examinee's breadth of content knowledge in the subject area. The tests are administered in five-hour sessions, during which examinees can take either one or two tests.

¹The SSAT exams also contain 20 nonscorable items for pilot-testing and equating purposes.

The SSAT exams in art, music, and physical education assess knowledge and skills in the following areas:

Art:
Creative Expression
Art Criticism
Art Heritage
Aesthetics
Relationships Among the Visual Arts and Other Disciplines
Role of Arts in Human Development
History and Theories of Art Education

Music:
Theoretical, Historical, and Cultural Foundations
Performance
Music Teaching and Learning
Repertory for Listening and Performance (K-12)

Physical Education:
Growth, Motor Development, and Motor Learning
The Science of Human Movement
The Sociology and Psychology of Human Movement
Movement: Concepts and Forms
Assessment and Evaluation Principles
History and Philosophy of Physical Education

More detail about the SSAT exams is provided in the test specifications in Appendix B.

Development of the Exams

Development of Test Specifications

Until 1992, the Commission used the NTE Specialty Area Tests, multiple-choice exams developed and administered by ETS, to verify the subject matter competence of credential candidates who had not completed an approved program. In 1987 and 1988, the Commission conducted validity studies of fifteen NTE tests. More than 400 secondary school teachers, curriculum specialists, and teacher educators reviewed the specifications for the tests, as well as the actual test questions. The participants wrote extensive comments about the tests and the changes that the Commission should make to them. Overall, the reviewers in each subject area made the following two general recommendations to the Commission:

- (1) Update the NTE tests and make them consistent with the California State Frameworks and Model Curriculum Standards, and
- (2) Supplement the NTE tests with written performance assessments in each subject.

In 1988, the Commission adopted a plan to develop a new two-part examination in each of the single subject areas, including art, music, and physical education. One part of each exam would measure the depth of the candidate's knowledge in the subject area through constructed-response questions. The other part would consist of multiple-choice questions that assess the breadth of the candidate's knowledge in the subject area.

The Commission's Executive Director appointed a Teacher Preparation and Assessment Advisory Panel in each of the subject areas. These panels consisted of teachers, curriculum specialists, teacher educators, and college faculty members. The Commission asked each panel to develop (a) content specifications for the planned new exams and (b) program standards for subject matter programs. The Commission instructed the panels to create exam specifications and program standards that were as congruent as possible with one another and consistent with state K-12 curriculum documents.

The Commission then conducted a field review of the draft content specifications. Copies were mailed to school districts, county offices of education, colleges and universities, and individual schools throughout California. Teachers, curriculum specialists, and subject matter faculty were asked to evaluate the importance of each content specification for prospective teachers, and to identify omitted content areas and skills. The advisory panels reviewed the results of the field reviews and revised the specifications as necessary. The Commission adopted content specifications for art, music, and physical education in August 1992. These were used as the basis for the subsequent development of the Praxis and SSAT exams.

Development of the Praxis Exams

After the field review established the validity of the content specifications and the Commission adopted them, the Teacher Preparation and Assessment Advisory Panels in each subject area worked closely with ETS to develop Content Area Performance Assessments (CAPAs), constructed-response tests that later became part of The Praxis Series.

The panels also recommended passing standards on each of the exams to the Commission. In their discussion of how well a minimally-competent entry-level teacher would perform on the exams, they considered the performance of university students who participated in a pilot-test of the items. In 1992, the Commission adopted passing standards for the art, music, and physical education CAPAs. These exams were first administered in the 1992-93 testing year.² At that time, candidates for Single Subject Teaching Credentials in art, music, and physical education who had not completed Commission-approved subject matter preparation programs were required to pass the appropriate CAPA and NTE exams.

² A testing year is from July 1 to June 30.

In 1992, ETS conducted national validation studies for ten subject areas, including physical education. Teachers and teacher educators of diverse ethnic and cultural backgrounds evaluated the validity and fairness of the item pools for each of the exams. One representative from California participated in each subject area. The participants rated (a) the match between the items and the content specifications, (b) the importance of the knowledge or skill measured by the item for the job of beginning teachers, and (c) the fairness of the items. Items that were identified as invalid or biased by panelists were removed from the item pool or revised.

In May 1993, ETS (a) split some of the CAPAs in half and began administering each half in one-hour sessions for which examinees could register separately, (b) changed the way scores were reported, and (c) incorporated the CAPAs into their new Praxis Series. For ETS to begin reporting Praxis scores (including those in art, music, and physical education) as scaled scores, ETS and the Commission conducted standard setting studies. In July 1993, the Commission adopted new passing standards for the Praxis art, music, and physical education examinations based on information collected in the first year of administration of the exams, the national validation studies, and the new standard setting studies.

To ensure the validity and fairness of the Praxis exams, test questions are reviewed for bias on an ongoing basis. During the exam development process, trained ETS staff review questions and potential test forms for bias. If the reviewer has sensitivity-related concerns about a test question or a test form, the reviewer and the test developer work together to resolve the issues. If the issues cannot be resolved, the test question or form goes to an arbitration panel of individuals internal and external to ETS, who then reach a consensus about whether the question or form conforms to ETS sensitivity review guidelines and procedures.

New Praxis test questions are pilot-tested at California colleges and universities before they are included in an exam form. Trained California scorers then read the questions and pilot-test responses and judge the clarity, appropriateness, ease of scoring, and fairness of the questions. Test questions are revised or discarded based on these evaluations.

Development of the SSAT Exams

In keeping with the Commission's 1988 plan to establish subject matter examinations that included both (a) constructed-response questions to assess a candidate's depth of subject matter knowledge and (b) multiple-choice items to measure a candidate's breadth of knowledge, the Commission, in January 1995, contracted with National Evaluation Systems, Inc. (NES) to develop and administer multiple-choice subject matter exams in 16 subject areas, including art, music, and physical education. Commission staff selected teachers and subject matter faculty to serve on Content Advisory Committees. Because the Commission had already adopted content specifications for art, music, and physical education, the role of the committees was to (a) work with NES to develop the new SSAT exams consistent with the content specifications and (b) recommend passing standards.

Additionally, Commission staff selected teachers and college and university faculty who represented diverse backgrounds with respect to ethnicity, race, culture, and gender to serve on a Bias Review Committee. This committee reviewed exam items, procedures, and materials for bias at several points in the development process.

Following the development of a pool of draft test items in each of the subject areas, the Content Advisory Committees and the Bias Review Committee reviewed each item for job-relatedness, accuracy, match with the content specifications, and bias. NES then conducted pilot tests of the SSAT items at colleges and universities in California. College seniors and students enrolled in teacher preparation programs who had specialized in the subject areas were recruited to participate. The pilot-test data were used to verify and improve the psychometric quality of the items.

The SSAT exams in art, music, and physical education replaced the NTE exams in December 1995 as part of the requirement for the Single Subject Teaching Credential for candidates who do not complete Commission-approved subject matter programs. Since that time, candidates for Single Subject Teaching Credentials in art, music, and physical education who have not completed Commission-approved subject matter preparation programs must pass the appropriate SSAT *and* Praxis exams listed in [Table 1](#) above.

Following the first SSAT administration in December 1995, the Commission and NES conducted additional item validation and standard setting studies. The Content Advisory Committees who worked with NES to develop the examination items (a) reviewed the items again for job-relatedness, accuracy, match with the content specifications, and bias, and (b) recommended passing standards. In February 1996, the Commission adopted passing standards for the SSAT exams in art, music, and physical education.

Administration of the Exams

The Praxis exams are currently administered six times a year by ETS, up from three times a year in 1995-96. The SSAT exams are currently administered by NES four times per year, up from three times a year in 1995-96. Both sets of exams are administered at multiple sites throughout California. In addition, ETS also offers the Praxis exams throughout the United States.

Alternative testing arrangements are available for both the Praxis and SSAT exams for individuals who cannot take exams on Saturday due to religious convictions or U.S. military duties, and for individuals who have disabilities. These arrangements include accommodations such as additional time, separate testing rooms, special seating arrangements, enlarged-print exam books, large-block answer sheets, sign language interpreters, and colored overlays.

[Table 3](#) below provides the numbers of exams administered in 1997-98, the most recent year for which complete data are available. Because some examinees took one or more exams on more than one occasion in the year, the figures in Table 3 represent the total numbers of exams taken, not unduplicated counts of examinees who took the exams.

Table 3: Number of Examinations Administered in 1997-98

Exam	Number of Exams Administered
Art	
SSAT Art	110
Praxis Art Making	111
Praxis Art: Content, Traditions, Criticism, and Aesthetics	120
Music	
SSAT Music	121
Praxis Music: Concepts & Processes	101
Praxis Music Analysis	94

Physical Education	
SSAT Physical Education	524
Praxis Physical Education: Movement Forms- Analysis & Design	326
Praxis Physical Education: Movement Forms- Video Evaluation	331

Scoring of the Exams

Scoring the Praxis Exams

Each examinee's response to each constructed-response question on the Praxis exams is rated by two experienced teachers who have been trained to rate Praxis responses in the particular subject area. Scorers are carefully selected, trained, supervised, and monitored to ensure highly reliable scores. They assign scores based on scoring scales. Appendix C contains the scoring scales for the art, music, and physical education Praxis exams. If the two scorers' ratings for a response differ by more than one point, an adjudication process, which involves a third scorer, is used to determine a rating.

The ratings assigned by scorers are multiplied by a scoring weight (if necessary). The weighted ratings are summed to arrive at a total raw score. The raw score is then converted to a scaled score that adjusts for the difficulty of the particular form of the test. Scaled scores range from 100 to 200. The minimum passing score varies by exam (see [Table 4](#) below).

ETS mails score reports to examinees four to six weeks after the Praxis exams are administered. Each score report shows the examinee's scores and indicates the examinee's passing status. For examinees who have taken the Praxis exams more than once, the score reports also show the examinee's cumulative record on the exams. Examinees receive a 23-page interpretive leaflet with their score reports. Appendix D contains an example of a Praxis score report for the Praxis music exams. Score reports for other Praxis exams are similar. The Commission receives Praxis scores in electronic format from ETS and used those data to create this report.

Scoring the SSAT Exams

The multiple-choice SSAT exams are machine-scored. Raw scores (i.e., the number of scorable items answered correctly) are converted to scaled scores that range from 100 to 300. Each exam is scaled such that the scaled score of 220 is the minimum passing score. The scaling process compensates for minor differences in difficulty across forms and is intended to ensure a constant passing standard for examinees across time. NES mails score reports to examinees four to five weeks after the SSAT exams are administered. A score report includes the candidate's overall score, the candidate's passing status, indicators of performance on each content domain of the exam, cumulative results for each SSAT test taken, and an explanation of how to read the score report. Appendix D contains an example of a score report for the SSAT in art. Score reports for the other SSAT exams are similar. The Commission receives SSAT exam scores in electronic format from NES and used those data to create this report.

Praxis and SSAT Examination Passing Standards

[Table 4](#) on the next page shows the Commission-adopted passing standards for the Praxis and SSAT examinations in art, music, and physical education for the period covered by this report (December 1995 - June 1998). For each subject, candidates must pass the SSAT exam and satisfy the Praxis examination requirement. For the Praxis exams in art, music, and physical education, the Commission adopted a partially-compensatory passing score model. For each pair of Praxis exams in a subject area, there is a "minimum score" for each exam, a "passing score" for each exam, and a "passing score" for the two exams combined. To satisfy the Praxis examination requirement in art, music, or physical education, candidates must either (a) earn at least the passing score on each exam or (b) earn at least the minimum score on each exam and at least the passing score for the two exams combined. With this passing score model, a high score on one exam can compensate for a lower score on the other exam, as long as neither score is below the minimum score. During the period covered by this report (December 1995 - June 1998), examinees could combine passing and minimum scores from different administrations of the Praxis exams in a subject area.

Table 4: Exam Passing Standards in Art, Music, and Physical Education

Exam	Minimum Score	Passing Score
Art		
SSAT Art	--	220 (57)
Praxis Art Making	163	171
Praxis Art: Content, Traditions, Criticism, and Aesthetics	150	160
<i>Praxis Art Combined</i>		331

Music		
SSAT Music	--	220 (56)
Praxis Music: Concepts & Processes	155	165
Praxis Music Analysis	164	169
<i>Praxis Music Combined</i>		334
Physical Education		
SSAT Physical Education	--	220 (61)
Praxis Physical Education: Movement Forms- Analysis & Design	152	158
Praxis Physical Education: Movement Forms- Video Evaluation	160	170
<i>Praxis Physical Education Combined</i>		328
Notes: Praxis minimum and passing scores are presented in scaled score points. SSAT passing scores are presented in scaled score points and, in parentheses, raw score points for one form of each of the exams. The raw points necessary to pass different forms of an SSAT may vary somewhat. Equating is used to make exam scores comparable across exam forms.		

In April 1999, on the basis of standard setting studies conducted in December 1998, the Commission adopted new passing standards for the SSAT exams in art and music. The Commission also replaced the partially-compensatory passing score model with a fully-compensatory passing score model for the Praxis exams in art, music, and physical education. The new standards in art and physical education were implemented for administrations of the exams after April 15, 1999. The new standards in music will become effective beginning with test administrations in September 1999.

Part 3

Preparation and Demographic Data for Examinees and Passing Rates on the Examinations

This part of the report provides preparation and demographic data and passing rates for candidates who have taken the Praxis and SSAT exams in art, music, and physical education since December 1995, when the SSAT exams were first administered, through June 1998. A description of the tables used to present the data is provided first. This is followed by the tables and discussion of the data for each of the three subject areas and a summary. ***To fully understand the tables and the related discussions, the reader needs to carefully read the descriptions that follow.***

Description of the Preparation and Demographic Data (Tables 5, 9, and 13)

Tables 5, 9, and 13 provide preparation and demographic information about candidates who have taken the Praxis and/or SSAT exams in art, music, and physical education, respectively, from December 1995 through June 1998.³ Data are provided for three annual cohorts of participants. For each subject area, each participant is assigned to a cohort based on the year the participant initially took either a Praxis or an SSAT exam for that subject area. For example, if a participant took the Praxis "Art Making" exam for the first time in 1995-96, and took "Art: Content, Traditions, Criticism, and Aesthetics" and the SSAT art exam for the first time in 1996-97, that participant was assigned to the 1995-96 cohort. Each participant is assigned to only one annual cohort. All candidates who attempted one or more of the required examinations from December 1995 through June 1998 are included. The 1995-96 cohort represents only part of a testing year because the data for that year are for December 1995 (when the SSAT exams were first administered) through June 1996. During this period, the Praxis exams were administered twice, and the SSAT exams were administered three times.

³Data for the 1998-99 test year are not included because complete data are not yet available.

The data in Tables 5, 9, and 13 come from the Praxis and SSAT registration forms completed by candidates when they register to take an exam. The tables reflect the most current information available for each participant; that is, information from the most recent registration form(s) completed by the participant. Some of the data are gathered on both the Praxis and the SSAT registration forms, but other data are only collected on one form. Gender and ethnicity are collected on both the Praxis and SSAT registration forms. Information about educational level, undergraduate college major, undergraduate grade point average (GPA), where preparation was received, and best language comes from the Praxis registration forms.

The SSAT registration form is the source of data on completed semester units in the subject area.

The "Did Not Respond" rows in Tables 5, 9, and 13 include two groups of participants: (a) examinees who completed the registration form, but opted not to respond to the question, and (b) examinees who did not take the test (i.e., Praxis or SSAT) whose registration form included the question. For example, in the data for completed semester units in the subject area, participants who took the SSAT but did not answer the question, and participants who did not take the SSAT, are included in the "Did Not Respond" row. The 1997-98 cohort has the largest amount of missing information because examinees in this cohort have had the fewest opportunities to take both the Praxis and the SSAT exams.

Although candidates are asked to indicate their ethnicity on both the Praxis and SSAT registration forms, the response categories provided differ. The SSAT registration form has a separate category for Filipino, but the Praxis form does not include Filipino. It is unclear which category Filipino examinees select on the Praxis form. As a result, only part of this group (those who took an SSAT exam) is identified separately and the other part (those who only took a Praxis exam) is mixed with the other ethnic groups.

In Tables 5, 9, and 13, it is difficult to compare the data for the three cohorts reported because, as indicated above, (a) the 1995-96 cohort represents only part of a year so it is expected to be smaller than the other cohorts that represent full years, and (b) the 1997-98 cohort has had the fewest opportunities to take the examinations so less information (i.e., greater percentages of "Did Not Respond") is expected. Furthermore, all the data need to be interpreted cautiously due to the frequently high percentages of participants who did not respond to questions.

Description of the Passing Rate Data (Tables 6-8, 10-12, and 14-16)

Passing rate data are provided in Tables 6, 7, and 8 for art, Tables 10, 11, and 12 for music, and Tables 14, 15 and 16 for physical education. The first two tables for each subject area provide cumulative passing rates and first-time passing rates, respectively, in relation to the entire examination requirement (i.e., the required Praxis exam(s) and the required SSAT exam combined). As described in Part 2 of this report, to pass the exams and satisfy the subject matter requirement in art, music, and physical education, participants must pass the SSAT exam and must either (a) earn at least the passing score on each Praxis exam or (b) earn at least the minimum score on each Praxis exam and at least the passing score for the two Praxis exams combined. The third table for each subject area provides both cumulative and first-time passing rates for each examination separately. Each of the three types of table (i.e., cumulative passing rate tables, first-time passing rate tables, and by-test passing rate tables) is described below, following general observations about the tables.

The cumulative passing rate tables (Tables 6, 10, and 14) and the first-time passing rate tables (Tables 7, 11, and 15) each provide data for subgroups of participants based on preparation and demographic variables. In all passing rate tables, passing rates are not provided for any subgroup with less than 25 participants, because a passing rate for so few participants is too unreliable for drawing any conclusions about the subgroup. Data are provided for the same subgroups included in the preparation and demographic data tables (Tables 5, 9, and 13), with the exceptions of subgroups containing less than 25 participants overall. For subgroups with too few participants to report reliable passing rates, data aggregated across several combined subgroups are provided to the extent that they are meaningful (e.g., educational level). No performance data are provided in the tables for variables for which only one subgroup contains more than 25 participants (e.g., best language); these variables are omitted from the tables. The description of the source and nature of the preparation and demographic data with respect to Tables 5, 9, and 13 also applies to these passing rate tables. The reader is referred back to the description of Tables 5, 9, and 13 relating to (a) data collected on each registration form, (b) "Did Not Respond" data, and (c) Filipino participants.

The cumulative passing rate tables and the first-time passing rate tables are based on data about cohorts of participants. As described for Tables 5, 9, and 13, in each subject area, each participant is assigned to a cohort based on the year the participant initially took either a Praxis or an SSAT exam for that subject area. The first cohort for which data are provided is the 1995-96 cohort, which, as described earlier, represents only a part of a year of testing (December 1995 to June 1996). The cumulative passing rate tables include data for *two* annual cohorts: the 1996-97 and 1995-96 cohorts. The first-time passing rate tables include data for *three* annual cohorts: the 1997-98, 1996-97, and 1995-96 cohorts (rationale below).

Cumulative Passing Rates: Tables 6, 10, and 14

Cumulative passing rates reflect the fact that candidates have multiple opportunities to pass the exams required for their selected subject areas. Cumulative passing rates are defined as the number of participants who have satisfied the examination requirement in the subject area divided by the number of participants.

The cumulative passing rates presented in Tables 6, 10, and 14 are provided for the 1996-97 and 1995-96 cohorts combined ("Overall Cumulative Passing Rates 12/95 - 6/98" columns) and for each of these two cohorts separately ("1996-97 Cohort Cumulative Passing Rates" columns and "1995-96 Cohort Cumulative Passing Rates" columns). For each of these three groups, information is provided about all participants and about participants who have attempted all three exams. The data for "All Participants" include individuals who have taken at least one of the required exams. The number of these participants (N), the number of them who had passed all three exams by June 1998 (N Passed), and the percentage who had passed all three exams by June 1998 (% Passed) are provided. Data for the smaller group of participants who have attempted all three required exams is also shown for both cohorts combined and each cohort separately. The number of these participants (N) and the percentage who had passed all three exams by June 1998 (% Passed) are shown in the tables.⁴

The number of these participants who had passed all three exams by June 1998 is the same as the number of all participants who had passed all three exams by June 1998, and, therefore, is not repeated in the tables.

Tables 6, 10, and 14 do not include cumulative passing rates for the 1997-98 cohort. Participants in that cohort have had too few opportunities to take and pass the required exams to make their cumulative passing rates meaningful and comparable to those of the other cohorts. Some participants in that cohort, for example, decided late in the testing year to take the tests and had only one chance in the year to take one of the required tests.

First-Time Passing Rates: Tables 7, 11, and 15

Tables 7, 11, and 15 show first-time passing rates, defined as the number of participants who satisfied the examination requirement in the subject area by passing each required exam the first time it was taken divided by the number of participants who have attempted all required exams. The first-time passing rates presented in Tables 7, 11, and 15 are provided for the 1997-98, 1996-97, and 1995-96 cohorts combined ("Overall First-Time Passing Rates 12/95 - 6/98" columns) and for each of these three cohorts separately (e.g., "1997-98 Cohort First-Time Passing Rates" column). For each of these four groups, three pieces of information are provided: the number of participants in the group who attempted all required exams (N), the number of participants in the group who passed each required exam the first time it was taken (N Passed), and the percentage of participants in the group who passed each required exam the first time it was taken (% Passed).

By-Test Passing Rates: Tables 8, 12, and 16

The third passing rate table included for each subject area shows both cumulative and first-time passing rates for each of the required tests separately. Cumulative passing rates in Tables 8, 12, and 16 are defined as the number of participants who passed the examination between December 1995 and June 1998 (regardless of the number of attempts) divided by the number of participants who initially attempted the exam between December 1995 and June 1997. First-time passing rates in these tables are defined as the number of participants who passed the exam between December 1995 and June 1998 on their first attempt divided by the number of participants who initially attempted the exam during that time period. For Tables 8, 12, and 16, passing a Praxis exam means meeting or exceeding the passing score, not the minimum score (see Table 4).

The Art Examinations

Preparation and Demographic Data

Table 5 on the next page provides preparation and demographic information about candidates who have taken the Praxis and/or SSAT exams in art from December 1995 through June 1998. Overall, approximately one-half (52%) of the 306 participants reported they had either earned bachelor's degrees or had completed bachelor's degrees plus additional coursework. Another 17 percent of the participants reported having at least Master's degrees.

The largest group of participants (40%) reported undergraduate majors in art. Education (15%) was the next highest reported college major. All other majors combined were reported by fifteen percent of the participants. A relatively large percentage of participants however, did not report undergraduate majors (30%).

Another related indicator of preparation for the art exams is semester units of coursework in art. One half of the examinees (50%) were relatively well-prepared with 37 or more units, perhaps with a major in art or a related field. Relatively small percentages of examinees reported less than 25 semester units (13%) and 25-36 units (12%). Participants who completed a college minor in art are probably in this third group.

Over half (55%) of the participants reported undergraduate GPAs from 2.50 through 3.49. Another 30 percent earned GPAs from 3.50 through 4.00. Only four percent of the participants reported average grades below a B- average (2.50). A little more than one-third (35%) of the participants reported that they had completed their subject matter preparation in California. Only 18 percent indicated they were prepared outside of California. Data are unavailable, however, from almost one half of participants (47%) for this question.

With respect to demographic characteristics, the majority (70%) of all art exam participants indicated that English was their best language. Less than one percent overall reported another language as their best language. More than two-thirds (70%) of the participants in the art exams were females, and 78 percent identified themselves as White. The next highest reported ethnicity was "Other" (9%). Very small percentages of the participants (less than 3% in each case) reported other ethnicities. With the exception of "Latino or Other Hispanic," there has been a slight trend toward less ethnic diversity in more recent cohorts.

Table 5: Preparation and Demographic Data for Art Exam Participants

Overall		Annual Cohorts of Participants					
12/95 - 6/98		1997-98		1996-97		1995-96	
N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%

All Participants	306	100.0	111	100.0	126	100.0	69	100.0
Educational Level								
Undergraduate	4	1.3	3	2.7	1	0.8	0	0.0
Bachelor's Degree	31	10.1	15	13.5	11	8.7	5	7.2
Bachelor's Deg. + Units	128	41.8	31	27.9	65	51.6	32	46.4
Master's Degree & Above	51	16.7	16	14.4	26	20.6	9	13.0
Did Not Respond	92	30.1	46	41.4	23	18.3	23	33.3
Semester Units in Art								
0 - 24	40	13.1	16	14.4	22	17.5	2	2.9
25 - 36	37	12.1	12	10.8	20	15.9	5	7.2
37 or More	153	50.0	64	57.7	55	43.7	34	49.3
Did Not Respond	76	24.8	19	17.1	29	23.0	28	40.6
Undergrad. College Major								
Education	45	14.7	9	8.1	25	19.8	11	15.9
Art	123	40.2	43	38.7	55	43.7	25	36.2
English/Humanities	19	6.2	8	7.2	9	7.1	2	2.9
Math/Natural Sciences	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Social Sciences	17	5.6	4	3.6	9	7.1	4	5.8
Vocational/Technical	10	3.3	1	0.9	6	4.8	3	4.3
Undecided	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Did Not Respond	92	30.1	46	41.4	22	17.5	24	34.8
Undergraduate GPA								
3.5-4.0	92	30.1	33	29.7	43	34.1	16	23.2
2.5-3.49	169	55.2	69	62.2	72	57.1	28	40.6
Below 2.5	13	4.2	6	5.4	6	4.8	1	1.4
Did Not Respond	32	10.5	3	2.7	5	4.0	24	34.8
Where Prepared								
California	108	35.3	42	37.8	47	37.3	19	27.5
Outside of California	55	18.0	14	12.6	30	23.8	11	15.9
Did Not Respond	143	46.7	55	49.5	49	38.9	39	56.5
Gender								
Female	213	69.6	72	64.9	87	69.0	54	78.3
Male	91	29.7	37	33.3	39	31.0	15	21.7
Did Not Respond	2	0.7	2	1.8	0	0.0	0	0.0
Ethnicity								
African American	4	1.3	1	0.9	2	1.6	1	1.4
Asian American	7	2.3	3	2.7	4	3.2	0	0.0
Filipino	1	0.3	1	0.9	0	0.0	0	0.0
SE Asian American	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Pacific Islander	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Mexican American	6	2.0	1	0.9	3	2.4	2	2.9
Latino or Other Hispanic	9	2.9	5	4.5	3	2.4	1	1.4
Native American, Amer. Indian, Alaskan Native	5	1.6	1	0.9	2	1.6	2	2.9
White	239	78.1	87	78.4	99	78.6	53	76.8
Other	26	8.5	7	6.3	11	8.7	8	11.6
Did Not Respond	9	2.9	5	4.5	2	1.6	2	2.9
Best Language								
English	213	69.6	65	58.6	103	81.7	45	65.2
Another Language	1	0.3	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	1.4
Did Not Respond	92	30.1	46	41.4	23	18.3	23	33.3

Passing Rates

Cumulative Passing Rates For All Three Required Exams Combined

As shown in [Table 6](#) on the next two pages, overall, for the 1995-96 and 1996-97 cohorts combined, of the 195 participants who attempted one or more of the required exams, 16 percent had passed both exams through June 1998. This 16 percent cumulative passing rate, however, includes 77 participants who, for one reason or another, did not attempt all three of the required exams. Of the 118 participants who actually attempted all three of the SSAT and Praxis exams (61% of all participants), and, thus, had the opportunity to pass all of the exams, 27 percent have passed all of the exams. The cumulative passing rates were substantially higher for the 1996-97 cohort than for the 1995-96 cohort.

The overall results in [Table 6](#) indicate that preparation is generally related to performance. Participants with undergraduate majors in art have a higher cumulative passing rate (24%) than participants with education majors (19%), the only other major reported by at least 25 examinees. Additionally, the higher the reported grade point average, the higher the cumulative passing rate. With respect to semester units of coursework, passing rates were higher, however, for examinees who reported completing 25-36 units (28%) than for those who reported more than 36 units (18%). This result may be due to the very small number of examinees who reported 25-36 units.

The cumulative passing rate for participants who completed their subject matter preparation in California (26%) was higher than for out-of-state-prepared candidates (20%). Information about where candidates were prepared is not available, however, for 45 percent of the candidates.

Female participants in the art exams have slightly higher cumulative passing rates than do male participants. Examinees who identified themselves as White (20% passing rate) outperformed the combined group of other reported ethnicities (3%). (The numbers of participants in the ethnic groups other than White were too small to report separately.) Given the steps described earlier in this report that the Commission, ETS, and NES have taken to eliminate bias from the exams, much of the ethnic group differences in passing rates may be attributable to differences in academic preparation. With so few participants of ethnicities other than White, however, it would be difficult to study explanations for differences in performance among groups in a reliable manner.

First-Time Passing Rates For All Three Required Exams Combined

[Table 7](#) below shows first-time passing rates on the art exams. Of the 164 participants in the 1995-96, 1996-97, and 1997-98 cohorts combined who have attempted all three of the Praxis and SSAT exams in art through June 1998, 17 percent passed each exam on their first attempt. First-time passing rates have fluctuated across cohorts with the 1995-96 cohort attaining the lowest passing rate and the 1996-97 cohort receiving the highest. The same patterns in passing rates among subgroups of participants noted above with respect to the cumulative passing rates exist with respect to first-time passing rates, with the exception of where candidates received their preparation.

Table 6: Cumulative Passing Rates on the Praxis and SSAT Art Exams (Combined)

	Overall Cumulative Passing Rates 12/95 - 6/98						1996-97 Cohort Cumulative Passing Rates					1995-96 Cohort Cumulative Passing Rates				
	All Participants			Attempted All 3 Exams			All Participants			Attempted All 3 Exams		All Participants			Attempted All 3 Exams	
	Passed			%			Passed			%		Passed			%	
	N	N	%	N	Pass	N	N	%	N	Pass	N	N	%	N	Pass	
All Participants	195	32	16.4	118	27.1	126	27	21.4	80	33.8	69	5	7.2	38	13.2	
Educational Level																
Undergraduate	1	--	--	1	--	1	--	--	1	--	0	--	--	0	--	
Bachelor's Degree & Bachelor's Degree + Units	113	21	18.6	87	24.1	76	17	22.4	58	29.3	37	4	10.8	29	13.8	
Master's Degree and Above	35	11	31.4	29	37.9	26	10	38.5	20	--	9	--	--	9	--	
Did Not Respond	46	0	0.0	1	--	23	--	--	1	--	23	--	--	0	--	

0 - 24	24	--	--	16	--	22	--	--	15	--	2	--	--	1	--
25 - 36	25	7	28.0	21	--	20	--	--	18	--	5	--	--	3	--
37 or More	89	16	18.0	63	25.4	55	13	23.6	42	31.0	34	3	8.8	21	--
Did Not Respond	57	4	7.0	18	--	29	2	6.9	5	--	28	2	7.1	13	--

Undergrad. College Major

Education	36	7	19.4	28	25.0	25	5	20.0	19	--	11	--	--	9	--
Art	80	19	23.8	64	29.7	55	16	29.1	43	37.2	25	3	12.0	21	--
All Other Reported Majors	33	6	18.2	26	23.1	24	--	--	18	--	9	--	--	8	--
Did Not Respond	46	0	0.0	0	--	22	--	--	0	--	24	--	--	0	--

Undergraduate GPA

3.5-4.0	59	17	28.8	45	37.8	43	15	34.9	30	50.0	16	--	--	15	--
2.5-3.49	100	14	14.0	66	21.2	72	11	15.3	44	25.0	28	3	10.7	22	--
Below 2.5	7	--	--	4	--	6	--	--	4	--	1	--	--	0	--
Did Not Respond	29	0	0.0	3	--	5	--	--	2	--	24	--	--	1	--

Where Prepared

In California	66	17	25.8	54	31.5	47	14	29.8	39	35.9	19	--	--	15	--
Outside of California	41	8	19.5	31	25.8	30	7	23.3	22	--	11	--	--	9	--
Did Not Respond	88	7	8.0	33	21.2	49	6	12.2	19	--	39	1	2.6	14	--

IMPORTANT NOTE: See "Description of the Passing Rate Data".

(continued on next page)

Table 6: Cumulative Passing Rates on the Praxis and SSAT Art Exams (Combined)
(continued)

	Overall Cumulative Passing Rates 12/95 - 6/98					1996-97 Cohort Cumulative Passing Rates					1995-96 Cohort Cumulative Passing Rates				
	All Participants			Attempted All 3 Exams		All Participants			Attempted All 3 Exams		All Participants			Attempted All 3 Exams	
	Passed			%		Passed			%		Passed			%	
	N	N	%	N	Pass	N	N	%	N	Pass	N	N	%	N	Pass
Gender															
Female	141	24	17.0	82	29.3	87	19	21.8	53	35.8	54	5	9.3	29	17.2
Male	54	8	14.8	36	22.2	39	8	20.5	27	29.6	15	--	--	9	--
Ethnicity															
White	152	31	20.4	91	34.1	99	26	26.3	62	41.9	53	5	9.4	29	17.2
All Other Ethnicities	39	1	2.6	25	4.0	25	1	4.0	17	--	14	--	--	8	--
Did Not Respond	4	--	--	2	--	2	--	--	1	--	2	--	--	1	--

IMPORTANT NOTE: See "Description of the Passing Rate Data".

Table 7: First-Time Passing Rates on the Praxis and SSAT Art Exams (Combined)

	Overall First-Time Passing Rates: 12/95 - 6/98			1997-98 Cohort First-Time Passing Rates			1996-97 Cohort First-Time Passing Rates			1995-96 Cohort First-Time Passing Rates		
	Passed			Passed			Passed			Passed		
	N	N	%	N	N	%	N	N	%	N	N	%
All Participants	164	27	16.5	46	5	10.9	80	20	25.0	38	2	5.3
Educational Level												
Undergraduate	1	--	--	0	--	--	1	--	--	0	--	--
Bachelor's Degree & Bachelor's Degree + Units	118	16	13.6	31	3	9.7	58	12	20.7	29	1	3.4
Master's Degree and Above	43	11	25.6	14	--	--	20	--	--	9	--	--
Did Not Respond	2	--	--	1	--	--	1	--	--	0	--	--
Semester Units in Art												
0 - 24	20	--	--	4	--	--	15	--	--	1	--	--
25 - 36	27	6	22.2	6	--	--	18	--	--	3	--	--
37 or More	96	16	16.7	33	5	15.2	42	9	21.4	21	--	--
Did Not Respond	21	--	--	3	--	--	5	--	--	13	--	--
Undergrad. College Major												
Education	35	4	11.4	7	--	--	19	--	--	9	--	--
Art	90	16	17.8	26	3	11.5	43	11	25.6	21	--	--
All Other Reported Majors	39	7	17.9	13	--	--	18	--	--	8	--	--
Undergraduate GPA												
3.5-4.0	62	16	25.8	17	--	--	30	12	40.0	15	--	--
2.5-3.49	90	11	12.2	24	--	--	44	8	18.2	22	--	--
Below 2.5	8	--	--	4	--	--	4	--	--	0	--	--
Did Not Respond	4	--	--	1	--	--	2	--	--	1	--	--
Where Prepared												
In California	86	14	16.3	32	4	12.5	39	9	23.1	15	--	--
Outside of California	39	7	17.9	8	--	--	22	--	--	9	--	--
Did Not Respond	39	6	15.4	6	--	--	19	--	--	14	--	--

IMPORTANT NOTE: See ["Description of the Passing Rate Data"](#).

Table 7: First-Time Passing Rates on the Praxis and SSAT Art Exams (Combined)
(continued)

	Overall First-Time Passing Rates: 12/95 - 6/98			1997-98 Cohort First-Time Passing Rates			1996-97 Cohort First-Time Passing Rates			1995-96 Cohort First-Time Passing Rates		
	Passed			Passed			Passed			Passed		
	N	N	%	N	N	%	N	N	%	N	N	%
Gender												
Female	111	22	19.8	29	5	17.2	53	15	28.3	29	2	6.9
Male	53	5	9.4	17	--	--	27	5	18.5	9	--	--
Ethnicity												
White	129	27	20.9	38	5	13.2	62	20	32.3	29	2	6.9
All Other Ethnicities	32	0	0.0	7	--	--	17	--	--	8	--	--
Did Not Respond	3	--	--	1	--	--	1	--	--	1	--	--

IMPORTANT NOTE: See "[Description of the Passing Rate Data](#)".

For the two cohorts that are included in both Tables 6 and 7 (i.e., the 1995-96 cohort and the 1996-97 cohort), it is possible to compare directly (a) the cumulative passing rates for participants who attempted all three exams with (b) the first-time passing rates. For both cohorts, the cumulative passing rates (13% and 33%, respectively) are higher than the first-time passing rates (5% and 25%, respectively). These differences indicate that participants who continue to attempt the exams after an initial failure can improve and pass the required exams. They also show that the Commission's policies of allowing candidates to take the exams on multiple occasions and of providing diagnostic information to examinees who do not pass have the effect of increasing the number of qualified teachers.

Cumulative and First-Time Passing Rates for Each Test

Table 8 below shows that, of the three required exams in art, more candidates have taken the SSAT exam than the Praxis exams, and candidates have been more successful on the SSAT exam. The cumulative passing rates on each exam are higher than the first-time passing rates.

Table 8: Cumulative and First-Time Passing Rates on the Praxis and SSAT Art Exams (By Test)

	Cumulative Passing Rates			First-Time Passing Rates		
	Passed			Passed		
	N	N	%	N	N	%
SSAT: Art	187	165	88.2	285	237	83.2
Praxis: Art Making	106	52	49.1	180	64	35.6
Art: Content, Traditions, Criticism, and Aesthetics	107	36	33.6	186	50	26.9

IMPORTANT NOTE: See "[Description of the Passing Rate Data](#)".

The Music Examinations

Preparation and Demographic Data

The preparation and demographic data for participants who have taken the Praxis and/or SSAT exams in music from December 1995 through June 1998 are provided in [Table 9](#) on the next page. Overall, 50 percent had either earned bachelor's degrees or had completed bachelor's degrees plus additional coursework. Twenty-five percent of the participants reported Master's degrees or above.

The largest group of participants in the music exams (58%) reported 37 or more semester units of coursework in music. This group would be expected to include music majors. Relatively few examinees reported 25-36 units (7%) or less than 25 units (13%).

The most frequent undergraduate college major was music (35%), with education majors (26%) reported second highest. All of the other majors combined were reported by less than 14 percent of examinees. Most participants (53%) reported undergraduate GPAs between 2.5 and 3.49. Thirty-nine percent reported GPAs between 3.5 and 4.0.

Somewhat more than one-third of examinees (38%) reported that they completed their subject matter preparation in California. Twenty-four percent indicated they were prepared outside of California. This information is not available, however, for more than one-third of the participants.

Most participants (74%) indicated that English was their best language. Just over two percent reported another language as their best language. Most participants identified themselves as White (80%). Almost 17 percent of participants in the music exams identified themselves as another ethnicity. Slightly more females (53%) than males (46%) took the exams.

Passing Rates

Cumulative Passing Rates For All Three Required Exams Combined

[Table 10](#) below provides the cumulative passing rates for the SSAT and two Praxis examinations (all three combined) in music for the 1995-96 and 1996-97 cohorts combined ("Overall" column) and separately. Overall, 29 percent of the 127 participants who attempted any of the three exams passed all three exams through June 1998. Of the 96 participants who have actually taken all three exams (76% of all participants), 39 percent have passed all three. The passing rates are somewhat lower for the more recent 1996-97 cohort than for the 1995-96 cohort, both for all participants and for those who took all three exams.

Table 9: Preparation and Demographic Data for Music Exam Participants

	Overall		Annual Cohorts of Participants					
	12/95 - 6/98		1997-98		1996-97		1995-96	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
All Participants	232	100.0	105	100.0	82	100.0	45	100.0
Educational Level								
Undergraduate	4	1.7	0	0.0	3	3.7	1	2.2
Bachelor's Degree	21	9.1	11	10.5	8	9.8	2	4.4
Bachelor's Deg. + Units	95	40.9	31	29.5	42	51.2	22	48.9
Master's Degree & Above	57	24.6	27	25.7	17	20.7	13	28.9
Did Not Respond	55	23.7	36	34.3	12	14.6	7	15.6
Semester Units in Music								
0 - 24	31	13.4	18	17.1	8	9.8	5	11.1
25 - 36	15	6.5	8	7.6	7	8.5	0	0.0
37 or More	134	57.8	62	59.0	50	61.0	22	48.9
Did Not Respond	52	22.4	17	16.2	17	20.7	18	40.0

Undergrad. College Major

Education	61	26.3	22	21.0	27	32.9	12	26.7
English/Humanities	14	6.0	5	4.8	8	9.8	1	2.2
Music	82	35.3	36	34.3	26	31.7	20	44.4
Natural Sciences	6	2.6	1	1.0	3	3.7	2	4.4
Social Sciences	11	4.7	2	1.9	6	7.3	3	6.7
Vocational/Technical	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Undecided	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Did Not Respond	58	25.0	39	37.1	12	14.6	7	15.6

Undergraduate GPA

3.5-4.0	90	38.8	32	30.5	37	45.1	21	46.7
2.5-3.49	124	53.4	66	62.9	42	51.2	16	35.6
Below 2.5	4	1.7	3	2.9	1	1.2	0	0.0
Did Not Respond	14	6.0	4	3.8	2	2.4	8	17.8

Where Prepared

California	89	38.4	33	31.4	35	42.7	21	46.7
Outside of California	56	24.1	27	25.7	20	24.4	9	20.0
Did Not Respond	87	37.5	45	42.9	27	32.9	15	33.3

Gender

Female	124	53.4	54	51.4	40	48.8	30	66.7
Male	106	45.7	51	48.6	41	50.0	14	31.1
Did Not Respond	2	0.9	0	0.0	1	1.2	1	2.2

Ethnicity

African American	5	2.2	3	2.9	2	2.4	0	0.0
Asian American	9	3.9	6	5.7	2	2.4	1	2.2
Filipino	1	0.4	1	1.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
SE Asian American	3	1.3	2	1.9	1	1.2	0	0.0
Pacific Islander	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Mexican American	1	0.4	1	1.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Latino or Other Hispanic	1	0.4	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	2.2
Native American, Amer.Indian, Alaskan Native	1	0.4	1	1.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
White	186	80.2	83	79.0	68	82.9	35	77.8
Other	18	7.8	7	6.7	5	6.1	6	13.3
Did Not Respond	7	3.0	1	1.0	4	4.9	2	4.4

Best Language

English	171	73.7	66	62.9	69	84.1	36	80.0
Another Language	5	2.2	2	1.9	1	1.2	2	4.4
Did Not Respond	56	24.1	37	35.2	12	14.6	7	15.6

IMPORTANT NOTE: See ["Description of the Preparation and Demographic Data"](#).

Table 10: Cumulative Passing Rates on the Praxis and SSAT Music Exams (Combined)

	Overall Cumulative Passing Rates 12/95 - 6/98					1996-97 Cohort Cumulative Passing Rates					1995-96 Cohort Cumulative Passing Rates				
	All Participants			Attempted All 3 Exams		All Participants			Attempted All 3 Exams		All Participants			Attempted All 3 Exams	
	Passed			%		Passed			%		Passed			%	
	N	N	%	N	Pass	N	N	%	N	Pass	N	N	%	N	Pass
All Participants	127	37	29.1	96	38.5	82	21	25.6	62	33.9	45	16	35.6	34	47.1
Educational Level															
Undergraduate	4	--	--	3	--	3	--	--	3	--	1	--	--	0	--
Bachelor's Degree & Bachelor's Degree + Units	74	22	29.7	63	34.9	50	13	26.0	41	31.7	24	--	--	22	--
Master's Degree and Above	30	14	46.7	29	48.3	17	--	--	17	--	13	--	--	12	--
Did Not Respond	19	--	--	1	--	12	--	--	1	--	7	--	--	0	--
Semester Units in Math															
0 - 24	13	--	--	10	--	8	--	--	6	--	5	--	--	4	--
25 - 36	7	--	--	6	--	7	--	--	6	--	0	--	--	0	--
37 or More	72	26	36.1	62	41.9	50	15	30.0	43	34.9	22	--	--	19	--
Did Not Respond	35	6	17.1	18	--	17	--	--	7	--	18	--	--	11	--
Undergrad. College Major															
Education	39	9	23.1	28	32.1	27	5	18.5	20	--	12	--	--	8	--
Music	46	23	50.0	45	51.1	26	12	46.2	25	48.0	20	--	--	20	--
All Other Reported Majors	23	--	--	22	--	17	--	--	16	--	6	--	--	6	--
Did Not Respond	19	--	--	1	--	12	--	--	1	--	7	--	--	0	--
Undergraduate GPA															
3.5-4.0	58	19	32.8	47	40.4	37	11	29.7	28	39.3	21	--	--	19	--
2.5-3.49	58	18	31.0	47	38.3	42	10	23.8	33	30.3	16	--	--	14	--
Below 2.5	1	--	--	1	--	1	--	--	1	--	0	--	--	0	--
Did Not Respond	10	--	--	1	--	2	--	--	0	--	8	--	--	1	--
Where Prepared															
In California	56	19	33.9	51	37.3	35	12	34.3	31	38.7	21	--	--	20	--
Outside of California	29	8	27.6	22	--	20	--	--	15	--	9	--	--	7	--
Did Not Respond	42	10	23.8	23	--	27	6	22.2	16	--	15	--	--	7	--

IMPORTANT NOTE: See "[Description of the Passing Rate Data](#)".

(continued on next page)

Table 10: Cumulative Passing Rates on the Praxis and SSAT Music Exams (Combined)
(continued)

Overall Cumulative Passing Rates 12/95 - 6/98					1996-97 Cohort Cumulative Passing Rates					1995-96 Cohort Cumulative Passing Rates				
All Participants			Attempted All 3 Exams		All Participants			Attempted All 3 Exams		All Participants			Attempted All 3 Exams	
Passed					Passed					Passed				
N	N	%	N	Pass	N	N	%	N	Pass	N	N	%	N	Pass

Gender

Female	70	26	37.1	52	50.0	40	15	37.5	31	48.4	30	11	36.7	21	52.4
Male	55	11	20.0	44	25.0	41	6	14.6	31	19.4	14	--	--	13	--
Did Not Respond	2	--	--	0	--	1	--	--	0	--	1	--	--	0	--

IMPORTANT NOTE: See ["Description of the Passing Rate Data"](#).

As with the exams in art discussed above, preparation appears to generally be related to performance on the music tests. Participants with undergraduate majors in music have a higher passing rate (50%) than those with education majors (23%). Undergraduate grade point average is also related to performance: the higher the grade point average, the higher the cumulative passing rate, but the relationship is not as pronounced as with art. These findings about the preparation of all 127 participants generally apply as well to the 96 participants who attempted all three exams.

Music exam participants who were prepared in California have a slightly higher cumulative passing rate (34%) than those prepared outside of California (28%). Unfortunately, however, information about where candidates are prepared is missing for one-third of the participants.

Female participants have a higher cumulative passing rate (37%) than male participants (20%). Passing rates are not reported by ethnicity because fewer than 25 examinees who identified themselves as ethnicities other than White took the exams.

First-Time Passing Rates For All Three Required Exams Combined

Table 11 on the page that follows shows first-time passing rates on the music exams. Of the 152 participants in the 1995-96, 1996-97, and 1997-98 cohorts combined who have attempted both Praxis exams and the SSAT exam in music through June 1998, 16 percent passed each of the three exams on their first attempt. First-time passing rates are increasing, however, with each subsequent cohort, from 15 percent for the 1995-96 cohort to almost 18 percent for the 1997-98 cohort. The same patterns in passing rates among subgroups of participants noted above with respect to the cumulative passing rates exist with respect to first-time passing rates. White examinees passed at higher rates (18%) on their first attempts than did the other combined ethnicities (11%).

For the two cohorts that are included in both **Tables 10** and **11** (i.e., the 1995-96 and the 1996-97 cohorts), the cumulative passing rates for participants who attempted all three exams can be directly compared with the first-time passing rates. As expected, for both cohorts, the cumulative passing rates (47% and 34%, respectively) are higher than the first-time passing rates (15% and 16%, respectively). These differences indicate that participants who continue to attempt the exams after an initial failure can improve and pass the required exams. They also show that the Commission's policies of allowing candidates multiple attempts and of providing diagnostic information to examinees helps to increase the number of qualified teachers.

Whereas first-time passing rates have increased slightly with each cohort, cumulative passing rates were lower for the 1996-97 cohort than for the 1995-96 cohort. This difference could result from the fact that examinees in the 1996-97 cohort had fewer opportunities to take the exams than did those in the 1995-96 cohort.

Table 11: First-Time Passing Rates on the Praxis and SSAT Music Exams (Combined)

Overall First-Time Passing Rates: 12/95 - 6/98			1997-98 Cohort First-Time Passing Rates			1996-97 Cohort First-Time Passing Rates			1995-96 Cohort First-Time Passing Rates		
Passed			Passed			Passed			Passed		
N	N	%	N	N	%	N	N	%	N	N	%

All Participants	152	25	16.4	56	10	17.9	62	10	16.1	34	5	14.7
-------------------------	-----	----	------	----	----	------	----	----	------	----	---	------

Educational Level

Undergraduate	3	--	--	0	--	--	3	--	--	0	--	--
Bachelor's Degree & Bachelor's Degree + Units	97	17	17.5	34	7	20.6	41	7	17.1	22	--	--
Master's Degree and Above	50	7	14.0	21	--	--	17	--	--	12	--	--
Did Not Respond	2	--	--	1	--	--	1	--	--	0	--	--

Undergrad. College Major

Education	48	6	12.5	20	--	--	20	--	--	8	--	--
Music	72	15	20.8	27	4	14.8	25	8	32.0	20	--	--
All Other Reported Majors	28	3	10.7	6	--	--	16	--	--	6	--	--
Did Not Respond	4	--	--	3	--	--	1	--	--	0	--	--

Undergraduate GPA

3.5-4.0	64	13	20.3	17	--	--	28	6	21.4	19	--	--
2.5-3.49	83	11	13.3	36	6	16.7	33	4	12.1	14	--	--
Below 2.5	2	--	--	1	--	--	1	--	--	0	--	--
Did Not Respond	3	--	--	2	--	--	0	--	--	1	--	--

Where Prepared

In California	76	16	21.1	25	4	16.0	31	8	25.8	20	--	--
Outside of California	45	7	15.6	23	--	--	15	--	--	7	--	--
Did Not Respond	31	2	6.5	8	--	--	16	--	--	7	--	--

Gender

Female	79	17	21.5	27	6	22.2	31	7	22.6	21	--	--
Male	73	8	11.0	29	4	13.8	31	3	9.7	13	--	--

Ethnicity

White	124	22	17.7	46	9	19.6	51	9	17.6	27	4	14.8
All Other Ethnicities	27	3	11.1	10	--	--	10	--	--	7	--	--
Did Not Respond	1	--	--	0	--	--	1	--	--	0	--	--

IMPORTANT NOTE: See "[Description of the Passing Rate Data](#)".

Cumulative and First-Time Passing Rates for Each Test

Table 12 below shows that more candidates have taken the SSAT exam than either Praxis exam, and that candidates have been more successful on the SSAT exam. The cumulative passing rates are, as expected, higher than the first-time passing rates for each exam. The differences in participation on the three exams *might* be a result of candidates taking the SSAT exam first because it is in a familiar format (multiple-choice) and then not taking the Praxis exams after learning that they

have not passed the SSAT exam. Passing rates on the two Praxis exams are similar.

Table 12: Cumulative and First-Time Passing Rates on the Praxis and SSAT Music Exams (By Test)

	Cumulative Passing Rates			First-Time Passing Rates		
	N	Passed		N	Passed	
		N	%		N	%
SSAT: Music	131	103	78.6	228	149	65.4
Praxis: Music: Concepts & Processes	83	45	54.2	144	50	34.7
Mathematics: Analysis	82	46	56.1	140	52	37.1

IMPORTANT NOTE: See "Description of the Passing Rate Data".

The Physical Education Examinations

Preparation and Demographic Data

Table 13 on the next page provides preparation and demographic information about candidates who have taken the Praxis and/or SSAT exams in physical education from December 1995 through June 1998. Almost two-thirds (62%) of the participants had either earned bachelor's degrees or had completed bachelor's degrees plus additional coursework. Another 10 percent of the participants reported earning at least a Master's degree.

In terms of coursework in physical education, candidates were either well prepared or not at all well prepared. The largest group of participants (40%) reported having completed less than 25 semester units in physical education courses. The next largest group (31%) had taken 37 or more semester units. Only eight percent reported 25 to 36 units, the category that would typically include individuals who completed college minors in physical education. The largest group of participants in the physical education exams (29%) reported undergraduate college majors in physical education. The next largest group (20%) were social science majors. More than two-thirds (72%) reported GPAs between 2.5 and 3.49. Another 12% reported GPAs between 3.5 and 4.0.

Table 13: Preparation and Demographic Data for Physical Education Exam Participants

	Overall		Annual Cohorts of Participants					
	12/95 - 6/98		1997-98		1996-97		1995-96	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
All Participants	872	100.0	348	100.0	345	100.0	179	100.0
Educational Level								
Undergraduate	14	1.6	6	1.7	4	1.2	4	2.2
Bachelor's Degree	93	10.7	34	9.8	39	11.3	20	11.2
Bachelor's Deg. + Units	448	51.4	145	41.7	202	58.6	101	56.4
Master's Degree & Above	85	9.7	28	8.0	39	11.3	18	10.1
Did Not Respond	232	26.6	135	38.8	61	17.7	36	20.1

Units in Physical Education

0 - 24	351	40.3	144	41.4	150	43.5	57	31.8
25 - 36	72	8.3	26	7.5	39	11.3	7	3.9

37 or More	266	30.5	123	35.3	89	25.8	54	30.2
Did Not Respond	183	21.0	55	15.8	67	19.4	61	34.1

Undergrad. College Major

Education	103	11.8	22	6.3	50	14.5	31	17.3
English/Humanities	56	6.4	18	5.2	23	6.7	15	8.4
Physical Education	255	29.2	89	25.6	118	34.2	48	26.8
Math/Natural Sciences	22	2.5	5	1.4	13	3.8	4	2.2
Social Sciences	173	19.8	56	16.1	76	22.0	41	22.9
Vocational/Technical	16	1.8	12	3.4	4	1.2	0	0.0
Undecided	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Did Not Respond	247	28.3	146	42.0	61	17.7	40	22.3

Undergraduate GPA

3.5-4.0	106	12.2	45	12.9	48	13.9	13	7.3
2.5-3.49	624	71.6	253	72.7	264	76.5	107	59.8
Below 2.5	78	8.9	38	10.9	26	7.5	14	7.8
Did Not Respond	64	7.3	12	3.4	7	2.0	45	25.1

Where Prepared

California	403	46.2	134	38.5	176	51.0	93	52.0
Outside of California	111	12.7	36	10.3	52	15.1	23	12.8
Did Not Respond	358	41.1	178	51.1	117	33.9	63	35.2

Gender

Female	341	39.1	130	37.4	143	41.4	68	38.0
Male	525	60.2	214	61.5	200	58.0	111	62.0
Did Not Respond	6	0.7	4	1.1	2	0.6	0	0.0

Ethnicity

African American	34	3.9	16	4.6	13	3.8	5	2.8
Asian American	17	1.9	4	1.1	10	2.9	3	1.7
Filipino	8	0.9	3	0.9	4	1.2	1	0.6
SE Asian American	2	0.2	1	0.3	1	0.3	0	0.0
Pacific Islander	8	0.9	4	1.1	3	0.9	1	0.6
Mexican American	51	5.8	19	5.5	17	4.9	15	8.4
Latino or Other Hispanic	16	1.8	8	2.3	8	2.3	0	0.0
Native American, Amer. Indian, Alaskan Native	14	1.6	5	1.4	7	2.0	2	1.1
White	670	76.8	259	74.4	265	76.8	146	81.6
Other	29	3.3	16	4.6	11	3.2	2	1.1
Did Not Respond	23	2.6	13	3.7	6	1.7	4	2.2

Best Language

English	635	72.8	209	60.1	284	82.3	142	79.3
Another Language	5	0.6	2	0.6	2	0.6	1	0.6
Did Not Respond	232	26.6	137	39.4	59	17.1	36	20.1

A little less than half (46%) of the participants reported that they completed their subject matter preparation in California. As with art and music, however, data about location of preparation are unavailable for a relatively large percentage of participants (41%).

English was the best language of 73 percent of the physical education participants, with less than one percent reporting another language as their best language. A majority (60%) of the participants were male. Seventy-seven percent of the participants identified themselves as White, and six percent as Mexican American.

Passing Rates

Cumulative Passing Rates For All Three Required Exams Combined

Cumulative passing rates on the SSAT and two Praxis examinations (all three combined) in physical education for the 1995-96 and 1996-97 cohorts combined ("Overall" column) and separately are presented in [Table 14](#) on the next two pages. Approximately 20 percent of the 524 participants overall who attempted any of the three exams passed all three exams through June 1998. A total of 353 of these participants (67%) have attempted all three exams, and 29 percent have passed all three. Cumulative passing rates are higher for the 1995-96 cohort than for the 1996-97 cohort. This is due at least in part to the fact that the earlier cohort has had more opportunities to take and pass the exams than the more recent cohort.

The relationship between preparation and performance is mixed for physical education. Candidates with a Master's degree or above passed at a higher rate (39%) than candidates with lower educational levels. Overall, the number of semester units in physical education does not predict performance. Although, candidates who report fewer than 25 units pass at the lowest rates (16%), examinees with 25-36 units passed at higher rates (28%) than those with more than 36 units (25%). Moreover, candidates who reported undergraduate majors in English or humanities performed better on the exams (37%) than did physical education majors (25%). Social science majors also passed at a rate almost as high as physical education majors (23%). Education majors performed the least well of the reported undergraduate majors (15%). These mixed results may be partly attributable to the fact that candidates may report units of coursework in physical education that may or may not be related to the exam (e.g., aerobics classes).

Unlike semester units in physical education, reported undergraduate grade point average is related to performance on the exams. Candidates who reported earning GPAs of at least 3.5 passed at more than twice the rate (26%) of candidates whose reported GPAs were below 2.5 (10%).

Table 14: Cumulative Passing Rates on the Praxis and SSAT Physical Education Exams (Combined)

	Overall Cumulative Passing Rates 12/95 - 6/98					1996-97 Cohort Cumulative Passing Rates					1995-96 Cohort Cumulative Passing Rates				
	All Participants		Attempted All 3 Exams			All Participants		Attempted All 3 Exams			All Participants		Attempted All 3 Exams		
	Passed		%			Passed		%			Passed		%		
	N	N	%	N	Pass	N	N	%	N	Pass	N	N	%	N	Pass
All Participants	524	102	19.5	353	28.9	345	54	15.7	225	24.0	179	48	26.8	128	37.5
Educational Level															
Undergraduate	8	--	--	3	--	4	--	--	1	--	4	--	--	2	--
Bachelor's Degree	59	8	13.6	46	17.4	39	5	12.8	29	17.2	20	--	--	17	--
Bachelor's Degree + Units	303	71	23.4	252	28.2	202	36	17.8	161	22.4	101	35	34.7	91	38.5
Master's Degree and Above	57	22	38.6	49	44.9	39	13	33.3	32	40.6	18	--	--	17	--
Did Not Respond	97	0	0.0	3	--	61	0	0.0	2	--	36	0	0.0	1	--
Units in Physical Education															
0 - 24	207	34	16.4	152	22.4	150	25	16.7	112	22.3	57	9	15.8	40	22.5
25 - 36	46	13	28.3	35	37.1	39	9	23.1	29	31.0	7	--	--	6	--
37 or More	143	36	25.2	121	29.8	89	17	19.1	73	23.3	54	19	35.2	48	39.6

Did Not Respond	128	19	14.8	45	42.2	67	3	4.5	11	--	61	16	26.2	34	47.1
Undergrad. College Major															
Education	81	12	14.8	67	17.9	50	5	10.0	38	13.2	31	7	22.6	29	24.1
English/Humanities	38	14	36.8	33	42.4	23	--	--	19	--	15	--	--	14	--
Physical Education	166	42	25.3	140	30.0	118	27	22.9	98	27.6	48	15	31.3	42	35.7
Social Sciences	117	27	23.1	92	29.3	76	13	17.1	56	23.2	41	14	34.1	36	38.9
All Other Reported Majors	21	--	--	16	--	17	--	--	13	--	4	--	--	3	--
Did Not Respond	101	4	4.0	5	--	61	1	1.6	1	--	40	3	7.5	4	--

Undergraduate GPA															
3.5-4.0	61	16	26.2	45	35.6	48	11	22.9	33	33.3	13	--	--	12	--
2.5-3.49	371	75	20.2	263	28.5	264	39	14.8	170	22.9	107	36	33.6	93	38.7
Below 2.5	40	4	10.0	31	12.9	26	2	7.7	20	--	14	--	--	11	--
Did Not Respond	52	7	13.5	14	--	7	--	--	2	--	45	5	11.1	12	--

IMPORTANT NOTE: See "[Description of the Passing Rate Data](#)".

(continued on next page)

Table 14: Cumulative Passing Rates on the Praxis and SSAT Physical Education Exams (Combined)
 (continued)

	Overall Cumulative Passing Rates 12/95 - 6/98					1996-97 Cohort Cumulative Passing Rates					1995-96 Cohort Cumulative Passing Rates				
	All Participants		Attempted All 3 Exams			All Participants		Attempted All 3 Exams			All Participants		Attempted All 3 Exams		
	Passed		%			Passed		%			Passed		%		
	N		N			N		N			N		N		
	N	%	N	Pass		N	%	N	Pass		N	%	N	Pass	
Where Prepared															
In California	269	71	26.4	230	30.9	176	39	22.2	145	26.9	93	32	34.4	85	37.6
Outside of California	75	16	21.3	55	29.1	52	10	19.2	36	27.8	23	--	--	19	--
Did Not Respond	180	15	8.3	68	22.1	117	5	4.3	44	11.4	63	10	15.9	24	--
Gender															
Female	211	42	19.9	152	27.6	143	22	15.4	101	21.8	68	20	29.4	51	39.2
Male	311	60	19.3	201	29.9	200	32	16.0	124	25.8	111	28	25.2	77	36.4
Did Not Respond	2	--	--	0	--	2	--	--	0	--	0	--	--	0	--
Ethnicity															
Mexican American	32	4	12.5	20	--	17	--	--	10	--	15	--	--	10	--
White	411	88	21.4	281	31.3	265	45	17.0	174	25.9	146	43	29.5	107	40.2
All Other Ethnicities	71	10	14.1	50	20.0	57	8	14.0	41	19.5	14	--	--	9	--
Did Not Respond	10	--	--	2	--	6	--	--	0	--	4	--	--	2	--

IMPORTANT NOTE: See "[Description of the Passing Rate Data](#)".

Physical education exam participants who were prepared in California have a slightly higher cumulative passing rate (26%) than those prepared outside of California (21%). Information about where candidates are prepared is not available for about 34 percent of the participants, however.

Male and female participants passed at approximately the same rates. Examinees who identified themselves as White passed at higher rates (21%) than did those who identified themselves as Mexican American (13%) or one of the other combined ethnicities (14%).

First-Time Passing Rates For All Three Required Exams Combined

Table 15 on the following two pages shows first-time passing rates on the physical education exams. Overall, a total of 509 participants in the 1995-96, 1996-97, and 1997-98 cohorts combined have attempted the SSAT exam and both Praxis exams in physical education through June 1998. Of these, 10 percent passed each exam on their first attempt. Unlike in music, however, first-time passing rates have not increased with each subsequent cohort, but have declined from 17 percent for the 1995-96 cohort to four percent for the 1997-98 cohort. The same patterns in passing rates among subgroups of participants noted above with respect to the cumulative passing rates are generally replicated with respect to the first-time passing rates, with one exception: examinees prepared outside of California passed at slightly higher rates on their first attempts (11%) than did California-prepared candidates (10%).

A comparison of the cumulative passing rates for participants who attempted all three exams with the first-time passing rates for the 1995-96 and 1996-97 cohorts shows that, as with art and music, the cumulative passing rates (38% and 24%, respectively) are higher than the first-time passing rates (17% and 10%, respectively). Participants who continue to attempt the exams after an initial failure can improve and pass the required exams. Allowing multiple attempts and providing diagnostic information appear to be helpful to candidates and help increase the number of qualified teachers.

Table 15: First-Time Passing Rates on the Praxis and SSAT Physical Education Exams (Combined)

	Overall First-Time Passing Rates: 12/95 - 6/98			1997-98 Cohort First-Time Passing Rates			1996-97 Cohort First-Time Passing Rates			1995-96 Cohort First-Time Passing Rates		
	Passed		N	Passed		N	Passed		N	Passed		N
	N	%		N	%		N	%		N	%	
All Participants	509	50	9.8	156	6	3.8	225	22	9.8	128	22	17.2
Educational Level												
Undergraduate	5	--	--	2	--	--	1	--	--	2	--	--
Bachelor's Degree	74	4	5.4	28	0	0.0	29	1	3.4	17	--	--
Bachelor's Degree + Units	356	33	9.3	104	4	3.8	161	16	9.9	91	13	14.3
Master's Degree and Above	71	12	16.9	22	--	--	32	5	15.6	17	--	--
Did Not Respond	3	--	--	0	--	--	2	--	--	1	--	--
Units in Physical Education												
0 - 24	214	14	6.5	62	2	3.2	112	9	8.0	40	3	7.5
25 - 36	48	8	16.7	13	--	--	29	5	17.2	6	--	--
37 or More	189	16	8.5	68	3	4.4	73	7	9.6	48	6	12.5
Did Not Respond	58	12	20.7	13	--	--	11	--	--	34	11	32.4
Undergrad. College Major												
Education	87	6	6.9	20	--	--	38	1	2.6	29	4	13.8
English/Humanities	45	5	11.1	12	--	--	19	--	--	14	--	--
Physical Education	203	21	10.3	63	2	3.2	98	13	13.3	42	6	14.3
Social Sciences	133	13	9.8	41	3	7.3	56	3	5.4	36	7	19.4
All Other Reported Majors	28	1	3.6	12	--	--	13	--	--	3	--	--
Did Not Respond	13	--	--	8	--	--	1	--	--	4	--	--

Undergraduate GPA

3.5-4.0	67	11	16.4	22	--	--	33	7	21.2	12	--	--
2.5-3.49	375	34	9.1	112	5	4.5	170	13	7.6	93	16	17.2
Below 2.5	49	2	4.1	18	--	--	20	--	--	11	--	--
Did Not Respond	18	--	--	4	--	--	2	--	--	12	--	--

IMPORTANT NOTE: See "[Description of the Passing Rate Data](#)".

(continued on next page)

Table 15: First-Time Passing Rates on the Praxis and SSAT Physical Education Exams (Combined)
(continued)

	Overall First-Time Passing Rates: 12/95 - 6/98			1997-98 Cohort First-Time Passing Rates			1996-97 Cohort First-Time Passing Rates			1995-96 Cohort First-Time Passing Rates		
	Passed		N	Passed		N	Passed		N	Passed		N
	N	%		N	%		N	%		N	%	
Where Prepared												
In California	328	31	9.5	98	4	4.1	145	14	9.7	85	13	15.3
Outside of California	79	9	11.4	24	--	--	36	5	13.9	19	--	--
Did Not Respond	102	10	9.8	34	1	2.9	44	3	6.8	24	--	--
Gender												
Female	216	21	9.7	64	4	6.3	101	8	7.9	51	9	17.6
Male	293	29	9.9	92	2	2.2	124	14	11.3	77	13	16.9
Ethnicity												
Mexican American	25	0	0.0	5	--	--	10	--	--	10	--	--
White	406	46	11.3	125	5	4.0	174	20	11.5	107	21	19.6
All Other Ethnicities	75	4	5.3	25	1	4.0	41	2	4.9	9	--	--
Did Not Respond	3	--	--	1	--	--	0	--	--	2	--	--

IMPORTANT NOTE: See "[Description of the Passing Rate Data](#)".

Cumulative and First-Time Passing Rates for Each Test

Table 16 below shows that more candidates have taken the SSAT exam than either Praxis exam, and that candidates have been somewhat more successful on the SSAT exam. The cumulative passing rates are higher than the first-time passing rates for each exam. The differences in participation on the three exams *might* be a result of candidates taking the SSAT exam first because it is in a familiar format (multiple-choice) and then not taking the Praxis exams after learning that they have not passed the SSAT exam. The difference in passing rates between the two Praxis exams is probably due to the nature of the two exams. Across the two Praxis exams, participants are more successful on "Analysis and Design" than on the "Video Evaluation."

Table 16: Cumulative and First-Time Passing Rates on the Praxis and SSAT Physical Education Exams (By Test)

	Cumulative Passing Rates			First-Time Passing Rates		
	Passed			Passed		
	N	N	%	N	N	%
SSAT:						
Physical Education	546	357	65.4	876	390	44.5
Praxis:						
Physical Education: Movement Forms - Analysis & Design	358	204	57.0	544	221	40.6
Physical Education: Movement Forms - Video Evaluation	338	169	50.0	518	157	30.3

IMPORTANT NOTE: See ["Description of the Passing Rate Data"](#).

Summary

Preparation and Demographic Data

Comparing the art, music, and physical education participants described in Tables 5, 9, and 13, respectively, yields the following observations. At least half of each group had a Bachelor's Degree or a Bachelor's Degree plus additional units, and between 10 and 25 percent had a Master's Degree or above. The participants in the art and music exams appeared better prepared than the physical education examinees. Among the art and music participants, half or more had completed 37 or more semester units in the subject area, and 13% had completed less than 25 units. In contrast, 40 percent of physical education examinees reported completing less than 25 units. The percent of reported undergraduate majors in the subject area of the exams ranged from 30% in physical education to 40% in art. The largest group of reported undergraduate GPAs was 2.5 - 3.49.

Although there is a substantial amount of missing information on this variable, it appears that perhaps the majority of each group was prepared in California. In art, the majority of participants were female; the reverse is true in physical education. Almost equal numbers of males and females took the music exams. All three groups consisted predominantly (77-80%) of White participants.

Passing Rates on the Art, Music, and Physical Education Exams

Table 17 provides a summary of the cumulative and first-time passing rates on the Praxis and SSAT examinations in art, music, and physical education. These data are taken from the passing rate tables presented earlier. More candidates for Single Subject Teaching Credentials take the physical education exams than take the art or music exams. Fewer candidates take the Praxis exams than take the SSAT exams across subject areas. Candidates for music credentials were more successful at meeting the combined examination requirement than candidates for art or physical education credentials, in terms of cumulative passing rates. Art and music were similar in terms of first-time passing rates. The comparatively low first-time passing rates on the physical education exams may be due to the fact that the physical education examinees seem to be the least prepared. Candidates may be more likely to take the physical education exams to attempt to add an authorization for which they are unprepared to another credential than are music or art examinees.

Table 17: Summary of Passing Rates on the Praxis and SSAT Exams in Art, Music, and Physical Education

	Cumulative Passing Rates					
	All Participants		Attempted All Exams		First-Time Passing Rates	
	N	% Passed	N	% Passed	N	% Passed
Art	195	16.4	118	27.1	164	16.5
Music	127	29.1	96	38.5	152	16.4
Physical Education	524	19.5	353	28.9	509	9.8

The cumulative passing rates for participants who took all three exams are higher than the cumulative passing rates for all participants. This is due to the fact that not all participants took all required exams. It appears that some candidates who do not pass the first exam they take decide not to take other exams in that field.

On each separate exam, cumulative passing rates are higher than first-time passing rates, indicating that candidates who persist after an initial failure can improve. A comparison of the passing rates of annual cohorts of participants in the earlier data tables shows that in art, the cumulative passing rate of all participants, the cumulative passing rate of the participants who attempted all three required exams, and the first-time passing rate on the exams combined have increased. There are mixed results in music, where the cumulative passing rates have decreased, but the first-time passing rates on the exams combined, have increased. In physical education, all three types of passing rates have decreased.

In art and music, females have higher overall cumulative passing rates than males. Passing rates for males and females on the physical education exams are almost equivalent. White participants have achieved higher passing rates than the other combined other ethnic groups have attained.

Although the relationship is somewhat mixed, preparation is generally related to performance on the art, music, and physical education exams. With the exception of physical education, participants with undergraduate majors in the subject areas have higher passing rates than participants who do not. Higher grade point averages are associated with higher passing rates in all three subject areas. Educational level is also positively related to passing rates. The data related to semester units of coursework are less definitive. In art and physical education, candidates with 25-36 semester units in the subject area have higher passing rates than did candidates with 37 or more semester units. These results may be attributed to the self-report nature of the data. Examinees may not remember or report accurately the number of units they have completed in the subject area. Coursework in a particular subject area may also not match up with the content measured on the exam. For example, in music, taking many units of ensemble may not prepare candidates to pass the exam.



| [Back to the Top](#) |
| [Goto Appendices for this Report](#)
| [Back to July 1999 Agenda](#) |
| [Return to "Agenda Archives"](#) |
| [Return to "About CTC"](#) |

